

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO.

SENATE ELECTION, 1892.

The attention of the graduates generally of the University of Toronto, but more particularly those in the Faculty of Arts, is directed to the following evidence and comments which are offered for the purpose of making them acquainted, not only with the present position of University affairs, but with certain recent developments which throw some light on Vice-Chancellor Mulock's attempts during the last five years to saddle the expense of the Medical Faculty on the University Endowment, in defiance of the understanding between the Faculty, the Senate and the Government, at the time the Faculty was established in 1887. The substance of these developments is to be found in the communications of the Bursar and the Architect, and in the Commencement address of the Chancellor. Although the full investigation of these matters was successfully resisted in the Senate by the Vice-Chancellor and his friends, enough appears from the evidence at hand to shew that the criticisms of the press and of J. S. are unanswerable. Some of these are reprinted here for the information of those who may not have seen them.

The following is a summary of what has been established :

1. In 1887 the Medical Faculty was established under an Order in Council which provided that its maintenance should be no charge on the University Endowment or income.

2. Notwithstanding this provision, Vice-Chancellor Mulock had plans secretly prepared for an Anatomical building, and in 1889, under cover of building operations for the Science Department of the University, he had the present Anatomical building erected, its real character being concealed from the Senate, the Trustees and the Government up to the time of its completion.

3. The Examination and Degree fees in Medicine, which formerly had gone into the general fund to meet the expenses of the Medical Examinations, he had also, secretly and without authority, set aside to create a surplus fund for the Medical Faculty.

4. He likewise had the fees received from Medical students for instruction provided by the Arts professors in Chemistry, Biology, Physiology and Physics placed to the credit of the Medical Faculty.

5. Moreover, in 1890, he obtained by misrepresentations to the Minister of Education a 999 years' lease from the University of two College street lots (value about \$75,000) to the Park Hospital, an institution intended to provide clinical instruction for students of the Medical Faculty.

6. In this lease it is provided that the only rent payable for the land shall be the small sum received from students for clinical instruction ; but these fees will not be payable unless the University erects, equips and maintains the additional buildings required by the Faculty for such work.

7. These provisions were inserted in the lease by Mr. Mulock without the authority or knowledge of the Senate ; nor has the Senate been yet permitted to decide whether it will accept the grave financial responsibilities thus attempted to be saddled upon it.

8. In 1891 the Government, on discovering the facts relating to the Anatomical building and the examination and degree fees, arranged that a rent should be paid for the

building by the Medical Faculty, and had the fees in question restored to the general funds of the University. This arrangement, which was approved of by the Senate, practically condemned the previous action of the Vice-Chancellor.

9. In 1892 a new arrangement was made by the Senate whereby the fees received from Medical Students for instruction in Chemistry, Biology, Physiology, and Physics go into the general funds of the University.

It will thus be seen that the questions relating to the occupancy of the Anatomical building and the fees received for examinations, for degrees, and for instruction in Chemistry, etc., have been settled. There remain, therefore, the complications relating to the College street lots, and the question whether the University will accept or repudiate the arrangements made by the Vice-Chancellor for clinical teaching in connection with the Park Hospital. An attempt was made in the Senate to effect a settlement of these questions, but the movement was resisted by the Vice-Chancellor and his friends, who not only defeated the proposition, but *endorsed the action of the Vice-Chancellor in respect both of the Anatomical building and of the Park Hospital scheme. With those who so voted we take issue, and we maintain that these practical questions should be grappled with and settled on the principles applied in settling the other difficulties created by the Vice-Chancellor's unauthorized actions.

Mr. Mulock has been equally culpable in many other ways. To University College he refused the much needed assistance to the staff which was subsequently provided by the intervention of the Chancellor; his statement that there was no money, even for a Modern Language Fellowship, being proved immediately afterwards to be grossly inaccurate by the Chancellor's report, which shewed that there were ample funds, not only for this purpose but for Lectureships in Latin, French, and German, and for other purposes. To those members who have made enquiries in the Senate, and who have attempted to secure for the University an honest and intelligent administration of affairs, Vice-Chancellor Mulock has been hostile to the point of rudeness; his opposition to the re-establishment of the Finance Committee being a marked example of his policy of keeping the Senate in the dark with regard to the financial position of the University.

It is quite evident from the language of Mr. Mulock's defence that he does not acquiesce in the arrangements already made with respect to the Medical Faculty, and that he cannot be trusted to carry out the details of that arrangement. Enough information is here given, we trust, to prove that it is imperative in the interests of the University, to repudiate the methods which he has introduced into its administration, and to discountenance all who are prepared to support him in a policy which has already done incalculable injury to the University.

We repudiate the ridiculous charge made by Mr. Mulock that our condemnation of his acts is due to "personal feeling"; and in reply we point to the notorious fact that more than three-fourths of the elected members of Senate, in Law, Medicine and Arts, who voted in favour of his action in connection with the Anatomical building and the Park Hospital scheme, are his personal friends; and we assert that the real danger at the present juncture is the candidature of these adherents of the Vice-Chancellor, who are still prepared to foist him and his methods on the University. Under these circumstances, we appeal to every elector to lay aside all personal predilections, and to vote only for those candidates who can be trusted to continue the work of reform which has recently been initiated. In this work we gladly recognize the great services of the Chancellor, and it is for the purpose of supporting his policy and of putting an end to the unsatisfactory administration of Mr. Mulock that we recommend as worthy of the confidence and support of the graduates, at the coming election, the following candidates:

CHANCELLOR:

HON. EDWARD BLAKE, M.A., LL.D., Q.C., M.P.

SENATORS:

W. H. BALLARD, M.A., Hamilton.

HON. S. H. BLAKE, B.A., Q.C., Toronto.

*For vote, see p. 9.

The f
Vice-Chan

THE C

In an
to the Bu
Park Hos

(1) T
the Minist
to defer c
Wycliffe

(2) T
the Trust
purposes
such mon
privilege
tions:—

(a) T
formerly
being lots
Park filed
the term
be held a
such Edu
Universit
behalf de

WM. DALE, M.A., Toronto.
 W. H. ELLIS, M.A., M.B., Toronto.
 HON. J. M. GIBSON, M.A., LL.B., Q.C., M.P.P., Hamilton.
 REV. W. T. HERRIDGE, B.A., Ottawa.
 WM. HOUSTON, M.A., Toronto.
 JAMES LOUDON, M.A., Toronto.
 W. F. MACLEAN, B.A., M.P., Toronto.
 JOHN SEATH, B.A., Toronto.
 WM. TYTLER, B.A., Guelph.
 W. H. VANDERSMISSEN, M.A., Toronto.

Signed on behalf the Committee :

J. SQUAIR, B.A., *Chairman*,

W. S. MILNER, B.A., *Secretary*.

The following representatives of Arts and Law Graduates endorsed the action of the Vice-Chancellor :

Prof. Baker,
 Mr. Justice Falconbridge,
 Mr. Barwick,

Mr. King,
 Mr. MacMurchy,
 Mr. Marsh, and

Mr. Creelman.

EVIDENCE AND COMMENTS.

THE COLLEGE STREET LOTS AND THE PARK HOSPITAL SCHEME.

Extracts from proceedings of Senate, April 29th and May 13th, 1892.

In answer to enquiries sent to the Registrar by Mr. Houston and by him transmitted to the Bursar, the following report was presented relating to the site of the proposed Park Hospital on University land adjoining College street :

(1) That on March 10, 1887, the following board minute appears :—" Letter from the Minister of Education was read at the meeting of the Board of Trustees asking board to defer consideration of application of parties to lease lots on College street in front of Wycliffe College."

(2) That on January 4th, 1890, lots 8 and 9, fronting on College street, were leased to the Trustees of the Park Hospital for 999 years, for the said Hospital and Educational purposes only, "yielding and paying therefor yearly during the said term by way of rent such moneys as the Senate may from time to time require to be paid by students for the privilege of attending said Hospital for Educational purposes" on the following conditions :—

(a) That the said hereafter demised lands (8 and 9), and also certain other lands formerly leased by the Bursar to the Protestant Episcopal Divinity School Corporation, being lots numbers 7 and 10, according to a plan of a subdivision of part of the University Park filed in the registry office of the city of Toronto as plan D 18, which said lease and the term thereby demised have been assigned to the said trustees of the Park Hospital, to be held and used by the said Park Hospital Trustees only for Hospital purposes and for such Educational purposes in connection therewith and with the Medical Faculty of the University of Toronto as the Senate of the said University may from time to time in that behalf determine.

(b) That Her Majesty for and on behalf of and as Trustee for said University of Toronto may from time to time erect and maintain on said lands, notwithstanding the estate therein of the Park Hospital Trustees, such building or buildings as may be deemed necessary by the Senate of the University of Toronto for Educational purposes in connection with the said Hospital, and for such purposes may use, occupy and enjoy the same.

(c) That no building or buildings shall at any time hereafter be erected by the lessees upon the said demised or other lands without the approval first had and obtained of the Senate of University of Toronto.

(d) That the successors of the Trustees of the said the Park Hospital Trustees shall from time to time be appointed by the Senate of the University of Toronto in accordance with the provisions of such statute or statutes as the Senate may from time to time enact.

(3) The Bursar reports that on January 4th, 1890, the following papers, viz., lease of lots 8 and 9 to the Trustees of the Park Hospital and lease of land on south side Hoskin avenue to the Protestant Episcopal Divinity School, were presented to him for execution, and assignment of lease of lots 7 and 10 by the Protestant Episcopal Divinity School Corporation to the Park Hospital for assent by the solicitor for the University, who stated that he came at the request of the Vice-Chancellor, that the papers referred to had previously received the approval of the Minister of Education, as signified by the usual memo. as follows:—"Approved. (Signed) Geo. W. Ross, Minister of Education." That thereon the bursar executed them, and, after entering the fact of their execution in the "seal book," they were taken away by the solicitor.

(4) That the duplicate original of the lease of lots 8 and 9 to the Trustees of the Park Hospital was returned to the Bursar by the solicitor on October 23rd, 1891, and that the lease of land on south side Hoskin avenue to the Protestant Episcopal Divinity School Corporation was returned to the Bursar on April 20th, 1892.

(5) That the arrangements which resulted in the execution of these papers were never submitted to the Board for its consideration.

(6) That on January 9th, 1890, the following appears in the minutes of the Board:—"University Park lots 8 and 9, lease to Park Hospital, approved. Lots 7 and 10, assignment of lease of Protestant Episcopal Divinity School to Park Hospital trustees. Land south of Hoskin avenue, lease to Wycliffe College of one acre, approved."

(7) That the documents themselves were not then, or at any time, submitted to the Board. With regard to the value of lots 8 and 9, the Bursar cannot undertake to make an estimate of the present value of the property.

In answer to the enquiries by Mr. Houston, it was stated that the Bursar of the University is the secretary of the Hospital Board, and that the members of the Board are:—W. Mulock, M.P., President; Geo. A. Cox, Henry Cawthra, John Hoskin, Q.C., Sir Daniel Wilson, William Christie, Hon. W. G. Falconbridge, Donald MacKay, Geo. Gooderham, James Scott, A. B. Lee, Hon. John A. Boyd, E. B. Osler, Sir Casimir Gzowski, and Hon. C. S. Patterson.

It was stated as the opinion of the University solicitor that the bequest of \$60,000, contained in the will of the late Senator Macdonald for the hospital, is void.

A letter was read from the Minister of Education stating that the lease of lots on College street was approved by him on the representation that the matter was one of great urgency, and that upon the promptness with which action was taken depended the gift of \$100,000 from the late Senator Macdonald, who was then lying at the point of death; and also because he was led to believe that the terms of the proposed lease had been previously agreed to by the Trustees of the University. The Minister further stated his willingness to consent to the restoration of the property to the University, if possible.

A communication was read from the Bursar, stating that Messrs. Mulock and Hoskin had been appointed by the Park Hospital Board to confer with the Minister of Education, the Trustees of the University and the Senate with regard to the difficulties about the College street lots; and also that the Board of Trustees had appointed Hon. Edward Blake and Prof. Loudon a committee for a like purpose. Mr. Houston gave notice of motion for the appointment of a committee of the Senate to confer with these two committees.

To en
B. Geikie,
for medic
was, durin
replies, of

On t
sent to th
proposed a
named in
anywhere
logical dep
departmen
and on the

With
following
safely be c
accommod
prepared b
are not pr
what pros

On th
as follows
the Comm
nent fund
University
approve of

On t
Minister c
replaced."

On t
been "des
"sketches
tion of th

On t
basement
made of C
pencilled
best of h
Board."

On t
adopted b
approval,
Council u
expenditu
Universit

On t
of the pr
were let.
portion of

THE ANATOMICAL BUILDING.

Extracts from Senate Proceedings, May 13, 1892.

To enquiries put by Mr. Maclean, based on published statements made by Dr. W. B. Geikie, to the effect that the western portion of the Biological building is largely used for medical school purposes, and that though manifestly intended for such purposes this was, during construction, a carefully kept secret, the Bursar and Architect sent written replies, of which the following is a summary :—

On the 19th of March, 1889, the Architect, at the request of Prof. Ramsay Wright, sent to the Bursar tracings from sketches of floor plans which he had prepared for "the proposed addition to the Biological building." On these tracings the various rooms are named in the basement, and on the ground first and second floors. No mention is made anywhere of Medical School uses, but in the basement there is a "storeroom for Mineralogical department"; on the ground floor there is "space reserved for Mineralogical department," besides a room for the "Professor of Geology" and a "preparation room"; and on the first floor space is reserved for "Geological museums."

With these tracings and proposals before them, the University Trustees adopted the following resolution :—"The Board recognize the desirableness of erecting, as soon as can safely be done, an addition to the new science building already in progress, with a view to accommodate Geology and other departments, and for which plans have been submitted, prepared by the University architect, at an estimated cost of \$60,000. But the Board are not prepared to recommend an expenditure from the capital fund until they ascertain what prospect there is of its being replaced, and from what source."

On the 20th March, 1889, an order was passed by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, as follows :—"Upon the recommendation of the Honourable the Minister of Education, the Committee of Council advise that the sum of \$60,000 be set apart, out of any permanent funds belonging to or invested for the endowment of the University of Toronto and University College, for the erection of such buildings as your Honour in Council may approve of, to provide better facilities for the Science department of the said University."

On the 11th April the Board instructed the Bursar to call the attention of the Minister of Education to their request "to know how the capital and income are to be replaced." On the following day the Bursar acted on this instruction.

On the 3rd of October, 1889, the Architect wrote to the Bursar stating that he had been "desired by the Vice-Chancellor" to send for submission to the Board of Trustees "sketches showing the proposed extension of the Biological building for the accommodation of the museum, etc." The estimate of cost is, on these plans, \$68,000.

On the sketch plan submitted on the 3rd of October rooms are named in the basement and on the ground and first floors, but not on the second floor. No mention is made of Geology or Mineralogy, nor is any mention made of Medical School uses, except in pencilled names on some of the rooms on the plans, which names, the Architect says to the best of his recollection, "were not there at the time the plans were submitted to the Board."

On the 17th of October, 1889, the plans for the proposed building were finally adopted by the Board and directed to be forwarded to the Minister of Education for approval, and, on the 14th of November, they were approved by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council under authority of a resolution of the Legislative Assembly, authorizing an expenditure of \$60,000 "for the accommodation of the Science department of the University of Toronto."

On the 5th of December, 1889, the Architect sent to the Bursar the working drawings of the proposed building, which were approved by the Board, and on which the contracts were let. On these drawings, as exhibited to the Senate, there are no indications that any portion of the building was intended for medical teaching purposes.

In his letter to the Registrar, dated May 11th, 1892, the Architect writes:—"I was instructed not to put names on the rooms used for anatomical purposes because, as I understood, of the possibility of objection being made by residents in the neighbourhood, such possibility being indicated by the opposition to the proposal to convert Wycliffe College old building into a hospital."

In the same letter, he says:—"My instructions were generally received through Prof. Ramsay Wright."

To Mr. Maclean's enquiry whether the Senate had ever been "consulted before construction on the subject of the designed use of the building," the Registrar replied that at the request of the Chancellor he had carefully searched the Senate's minutes, and had found no reference in them of any kind to the proposed addition to the Biological building.

To Mr. Maclean's enquiry as to who is responsible for the preparation of the plans and the proceedings which resulted in the erection of the building, no answer was returned except a reference to the documents above summarized.

The answer to the last enquiry was, however, furnished at the meeting of Senate held June 3, 1892, when the following letter was received from the Vice-Chancellor:—

"With reference to the correspondence submitted to the Senate at its last meeting on the subject of the completion of the Biological building, in which the University Architect stated that he 'generally received his instructions from Professor Ramsay Wright,' I desire to say that it was at my request that Professor Wright assisted the Architect in the preparation of the plans, and that Professor Wright is in no way responsible for any question of policy in connection therewith, such as the assignment of accommodations for medical teaching purposes, the omission of names from the plans indicating the purposes for which certain of the rooms were intended, or the like."

It thus appears that the Vice-Chancellor was alone responsible for the preparation of the plans and the erection of the Anatomical building.

UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS.

Editorial of the Toronto Mail, May 23, 1892.

In the articles on University topics which have appeared in these columns since the disastrous fire of January, 1890, we have made frequent reference to the great services rendered to the institution by the Chancellor, Hon. Edward Blake, more especially in connection with his splendid report of April, 1891, on its revenues and requirements. The policy then laid down created a complete revolution in the management of University affairs, and the general approval with which the change was greeted was a significant comment on the unsatisfactory methods which had been introduced for the first time into University administration by Vice-Chancellor Mulock. What these methods were the public will readily understand from the account of two transactions which have been a subject of recent enquiry in the Senate, and which were described in the published proceedings of the last two meetings. The first of these relates to the alienation of University lands on College street of the value of about \$80,000 to the Park Hospital Trustees, who had acquired the old Wycliffe College building. In this matter neither the University Trustees, who are specially charged with the management of the endowment, nor the Senate, who, according to the Act, "have the management of and superintendency over the affairs and business of the University," were consulted, Mr. Mulock having personally assumed to obtain the assent of the Government. This he succeeded in doing, according to the letter of the Minister of Education, by representing that, "upon the promptness with which action was taken depended a gift of \$100,000"; and also "that the terms of the proposed lease had been previously agreed to by the Trustees of the University." It now

appears th
only \$40,0
circumsta
secure the
Mr. Mulo
irregular
hospital,
no doubt
being esta
Under the
the pressi
a free hos
been mad

The c
into stron
led to the
Medical
appears th
as to the
Geology,
very first
trustees v
purposes,
Wright.
erecting
amount (\$
the very
the erecti
these buil
by the Tr
Against a
protested
ment to c
six month
reasonabl
sketch pl
peared, a
blanks w
which we
the objec
to the sch
reason in
sary to c
the publi
pursue th
endorse
of Univ
tary evi
Geikie's
that this
ment kn
ings."
ment; a
question
in the u
received

rites:—"I was because, as I neighbourhood, advert Wycliffe

ceived through

ed before con-
replied that at
and had found
building

n of the plans
r was returned

of Senate held
llor:—

st meeting on
sity Architect
right,' I desire
ect in the pre-
r any question
ns for medical
oses for which

preparation of

ms since the
great services
especially in
requirements.
of University
a significant
first time into
ods were the
n have been a
shed proceed-
of University
Trustees, who
ent University
ent, nor the
ency over the
ng personally
according to
mpiness with
terms of the
ty." It now

appears that the Trustees had not been consulted, and that the alleged gift amounted to only \$40,000, the further bequest of \$60,000 having been declared void. Under these circumstances the Minister has declared his readiness to accede to a widespread demand to secure the cancellation of the transaction. This is not the place to discuss the merits of Mr. Mulock's hospital scheme, but we may say in passing that, apart altogether from the irregularities above referred to, the plan was crude and ill-advised. An independent hospital, in which the University Medical Faculty would have exclusive privileges, would no doubt be an advantage; but there never was the slightest prospect of any institution being established which would not be a mere annex to the Toronto General Hospital. Under the circumstances, considering the straightened condition of the University funds and the pressing claims of the different departments for better equipment, the proposal to give a free hospital site on the most valuable part of the University property could only have been made by one who was utterly indifferent to the welfare of the Arts department.

The questionable means employed in rushing through the hospital lease are thrown into strong relief by the account published in last Monday's *Mail* of the proceedings which led to the erection of the so-called Museum wing of the Biological building, in which the Medical Faculty is now installed. From the documents submitted to the Senate, it appears that the University Trustees, the Government and the Legislature were all misled as to the real character of the structure, which was variously represented as being for Geology, Mineralogy and Biology, and for the Science department of the University. The very first steps taken in this matter have a suspicious look. On March 19, 1889, the trustees were asked to approve of a building for Geological, Mineralogical and Biological purposes, according to plans submitted by the Architect at the request of Professor Ramsay Wright. In response to this request, the Board formally approves of the desirableness of erecting such a building, but declines to recommend the expenditure of the required amount (\$60,000) out of the capital, until they ascertain how it is to be recouped. On the very next day the Government, by Order-in-Council, appropriated the desired sum for the erection of buildings for the Science department of the University, the objects of these buildings, be it observed, being stated in general terms, whilst those recommended by the Trustees were specifically stated and set forth* on the plans submitted to them. Against action on the part of the Government in appropriating \$60,000, the Trustees again protested, but in vain. The published documents do not state who inspired the Government to override the Trustees; but the second move in the matter, which was made about six months after, when the Vice-Chancellor publicly appeared on the scene, removes all reasonable doubts on the point. On this occasion he submitted to the Trustees an amended sketch plan from which the express designations of Geology and Mineralogy had disappeared, all the names of the rooms being left blank, except those for Biology. These blanks were left by the Architect, acting under instructions, in the case of all those rooms which were designed for medical teaching purposes. The Architect now informs us that the object of omitting the real names was, as he understood, to prevent possible objections to the scheme on the part of the public—a questionable proceeding, and a highly improper reason in connection with a public undertaking. But why, it may be asked, was it necessary to conceal the real character of the plan from the Trustees, to whom alone, and not to the public, the sketch plans were submitted? And why was it considered expedient to pursue the same course with reference to the final plans which the Government were led to endorse as being plans of a structure "for the accommodation of the Science department of University?" Plainly for the purpose of concealing the Ethiopian: for the documentary evidence produced in the Senate, clearly proves the absolute correctness of Dr. Geikie's charge that "the building was manifestly intended for medical teaching purposes; that this fact was, during construction, a carefully kept secret; and that even the Government knew nothing of these purposes till some months after the completion of the buildings." It now appears that the Trustees and the Senate knew no more than the Government; and Mr. Mulock, who is chairman of both bodies, overrode the former on the question of expenditure, and deceived them as to its object, whilst he ignored the latter in the matter of educational policy. We observe that the Architect states that he generally received his instructions from Prof. Ramsay Wright. It is not credible that a member of

But see letter of J. S., § 1. p. 13.

the staff would undertake, without authority, to have plans prepared, even if they were confined to the legitimate purposes of his department; and we accordingly express the hope that the Professor will be able to show that he was the mere medium of communication with the Architect, and that he was acting under instructions.

As to the Vice-Chancellor, the whole proceedings go to show that he has an utter misconception of the functions and duties of the high office which he has so long and, as it now appears, so autocratically filled. As Chairman of the Board of Trustees it was his first duty to repay the confidence that body reposed in him by frankness and a readiness to fully explain what was laid before them. As Vice-Chancellor it was his duty to the Senate which elected him to see that they were not ignored, but that they were consulted on all matters relating to the educational policy of the University. As chief executive officer of the University, and as one who, in that capacity, was fully trusted by the Government, it was his duty to represent to the Minister of Education the deliberate opinions of the Senate and the Trustees, and to put the Government, which assumed the responsibility of taking action, into full possession of all the facts and considerations connected with the matters submitted to them.

ACTION OF THE ARTS FACULTIES OF UNIVERSITY COLLEGE AND THE UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO.

Resolution communicated to the Senate, May 11th, 1892 :

At a meeting of the joint Faculties in Arts of University College and the University of Toronto, held on Monday, May 8th, at which the President, Professors Loudon, Baker, Hutton, Pike, Alexander, McCurdy and Chapman; Messrs. vanderSmitten, Dale, Keys, Squair, Fairclough, Cameron and Milner were present, the following resolution was adopted :

"That in the opinion of the joint Arts Faculties of University College and of the University of Toronto, the alienation of the College street lots to the Park Hospital under a lease for 999 years, which was executed by the Bursar at the request of the Vice-Chancellor, and with the approval of the Minister of Education, and without the knowledge or approval of the Senate or Board of Trustees, and under terms which contemplate the erection and maintenance by the University of additional buildings for medical teaching purposes, is a serious loss to the University, and that the Senate be requested to take steps with a view to the restoration of the property, and that copies of this resolution be sent to the Minister of Education and to the Senate.

ACTION OF THE UNIVERSITY COLLEGE ALUMNI ASSOCIATION.

Resolution communicated to the Senate, May 12th, 1892 :

That, in view of the serious financial loss to the University which has been occasioned by the alienation of lots 8 and 9 on College street to the Park Hospital Trustees, the Executive Committee of the University College Alumni Association request the Senate to take immediate steps to secure the restoration of the property.

At t
with the v
the comm

" Mr
of Prof. C
mover, be
lots on C
Bursar's r
to report
said lots t

On t
Toronto
of order,

Rev.
heard wit
lishment
to place
continued

Mr.
as follow
omitted,
that the
to the Pa
was actu
approve
policy."

Mr.
YE
Houston

NAY
Ramsay
His Hon
Mr. Mac
Dr. Carr
James M
Father T

The
Rev. Fa

YE
Ramsay
His Ho
Mr. Ma
cellor B
McBrac
Father
NAY

Houston
It
only ag
connect
ing :

ACTION OF THE SENATE.

At the meeting of the Senate, held June 3, 1892, the following motion was moved with the view of reporting on the transaction of the College street lots, after conferring with the committees appointed by the University Trustees, and the Park Hospital Trustees:—

“Mr. Houston moved, seconded by Prof. Loudon, that a special committee, consisting of Prof. Galbraith, Mr. A. B. Aylesworth, Dr. J. J. McLaren, Dr. I. H. Cameron and the mover, be appointed with instructions to enquire into and report on the conveyance of two lots on College street to the Trustees of the proposed Park Hospital, as set forth in the Bursar's report laid before the Senate at its meeting held on the 20th April ult., and also to report whether it is expedient to take any steps with a view to the restoration of the said lots to the control of the University.”

On this motion being put, the Vice-Chancellor delivered his defence (published in the Toronto papers June 6, 1892), after which the following amendments, though plainly out of order, as the defence also was, were allowed by the meeting:—

Rev. Dr. Burwash moved, seconded by Rev. Father Teefy: “That the Senate has heard with great satisfaction the explanations made by Mr. Mulock touching the establishment of the Park Hospital and the addition to the Biological Laboratory, and desires to place upon record its appreciation of his action in connection therewith, and its continued confidence in him as Vice-Chancellor of this University.”

Mr. Houston moved, seconded by Prof. Galbraith, an amendment to the amendment as follows:—“That all the words after ‘that,’ where it first occurs in the amendment, be omitted, and the following inserted instead thereof:—‘While there is no reason to doubt that the Vice-Chancellor in his action with respect to the lease of the College street lots to the Park Hospital Board, and the erection of the addition to the Biological building, was actuated by a desire to promote the interest of the University, this Senate cannot approve of his conduct in neglecting to consult it on such important matters of academical policy.’”

Mr. Houston's amendment to the amendment was rejected on the following division:

YEAS—Prof. Galbraith, Mr. Embree, Prof. Hutton, Dr. Ogden, Prof. Loudon, Mr. Houston, Mr. Maclean.

NAYS—Dr. O'Sullivan, Dr. Willmott, Sir Daniel Wilson, Dr. W. T. Aikins, Prof. Ramsay Wright, Mr. Barwick, Dr. McFarlane, Rev. Dr. Dewart, Rev. Dr. Burwash, His Honor Judge Dean, Mr. Marsh, Dr. Larratt Smith, Dr. I. H. Cameron, Mr. Moss, Mr. MacMurchy, Mr. Justice Falconbridge, Prof. Baker, Mr. King, Mr. Creelman, Rev. Dr. Carman, Chancellor Boyd, Mr. Justice MacLennan, Rev. Father McBrady, Prof. James Mills, Mr. Hoyles, Rev. Dr. Sheraton, Dr. A. H. Wright, Rev. Dr. Reynar, Rev. Father Teefy.

The above amendment, which was moved by Rev. Dr. Burwash, and seconded by Rev. Father Teefy, was carried on the following division:—

YEAS—Dr. O'Sullivan, Dr. Willmott, Sir Daniel Wilson, Dr. W. T. Aikins, Prof. Ramsay Wright, Mr. Barwick, Dr. McFarlane, Rev. Dr. Dewart, Chancellor Burwash, His Honor Judge Dean, Mr. Marsh, Dr. Larratt Smith, Dr. I. H. Cameron, Mr. Moss, Mr. MacMurchy, Mr. Justice Falconbridge, Prof. Baker, Mr. King, Mr. Creelman, Chancellor Boyd, Mr. Justice MacLennan, Rev. Dr. Carman, Prof. James Mills, Rev. Father McBrady, Dr. A. H. Wright, Mr. Hoyles, Rev. Dr. Sheraton, Rev. Dr. Reynar, Rev. Father Teefy.

NAYS—Prof. Galbraith, Mr. Embree, Prof. Hutton, Dr. Ogden, Prof. Loudon, Mr. Houston.

It will be observed that the following representatives of Arts graduates voted not only against the enquiry asked for, but in favour of Vice-Chancellor Mulock's action in connection with the Park Hospital scheme, and in the erection of the Anatomical building:

Prof. Baker,	Mr. Barwick,
Mr. Justice Falconbridge,	Mr. King, and
Mr. MacMurchy	

UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS.

Editorial of the Toronto Mail, June 10, 1892.

The lengthy statement made by Mr. Mulock, and published in last Monday's *Mail*, in defence of his action in connection with the erection of the Anatomical building and the lease of the College street lots to the Park Hospital calls for a comparatively brief reply, so far at least as our previous criticism, which is now more than justified, is concerned. In the former matter it now appears that he undertook on his sole responsibility to provide accommodation for anatomy; that he attempted this most important departure in educational policy without the necessary authorization of the Senate and the Government; that he concealed his project from the Trustees, whom he professed to consult, and from the Government when submitting his plans; and that his secret was so well kept that the authorities did not discover the real object of the building until it was erected. This studied policy of concealment Mr. Mulock not only acknowledges, but attempts to justify on the ground that it was necessary in order to prevent the public, and more particularly that dreadful fellow, Dr. Geikie, from wrecking his project. What is particularly disappointing in this part of the defence is the absence of any expression of regret for having attempted to effect an important change in University policy by resorting to such an unheard of succession of concealments. So far, indeed, did he carry this system that even the President of the University was not admitted to the secret; and it is now patent that the chief concern of the Vice-Chancellor was to keep his designs from the knowledge of the Government until the building should be finished. With these facts before us we are slow to credit his pretended belief that the whole University was "of one mind in favour of his policy and the special undertaking in question," nor can we put implicit faith in the genuineness of his alleged surprise at the disapproval of the Government on discovering the conspiracy. Finally, we are unable to reconcile his assertion, that the action of the Senate in establishing the Medical Faculty involved the carrying out of such a scheme as the one in question, with the fact that he had perfect knowledge of the clear understanding between the Senate and the Government that the Medical Faculty should be no charge on the endowment.

In defence of his action in the matter of the College street lots, Mr. Mulock makes a great parade of a knowledge of and assent to some project about a Park Hospital which was talked of in 1887; but on examination it is seen that no plan then existed such as that consummated in 1890, when the lease in question was made. It is further seen that the view in 1887 was that at least \$150,000 would be required for the scheme; so that even on the assumption that the Macdonald bequest was valid, the amount mentioned in connection with the 1890 scheme was deficient by \$50,000. Moreover, we fail to find in the defence any proof that the lease of the College street lots had been agreed to on any terms, still less on the terms arranged by Mr. Mulock. It was, therefore, incorrect for him to represent to the Minister of Education that the consent of the Trustees had been obtained to this particular transaction. This is the important fact to be remembered, because it was mainly on the strength of this representation that the Minister's approval was secured. Although the Minister's approval had thus been improperly obtained, it was still possible for the Vice-Chancellor to ask for the sanction of the University Trustees before submitting the lease for acceptance by the Hospital Trustees. But what was his course? The latter were summoned on January 7th and the transaction completed, and on January 9th, when approval or disapproval could mean nothing, the University Board, the guardians of the property, at an ordinary meeting are asked, in the absence of all documents and without any explanations from the chairman, Mr. Mulock, to record a farcical approval. Of the names of the gentlemen who attended these meetings, Mr. Mulock makes a great parade, for the obvious purpose of creating the impression that as members of the Hospital Board, if not of the University Board, they must have fully known the nature of the transaction. On this point it is sufficient to remark that, although at the first meeting he submitted a lengthy report, which he closed by apologizing for not having obtained authority for the steps he had previously taken, he took no

pains to
gentlemen
stand its
we obser
only not
nor ever
informs
by him
departur
avoided

Wi
their de
understa
observe
must be
difficult
various
believe
last mee
duty sti
nized by
commit
Educate

Or
regard
Mulock

In
referen
Faculty
action
Anato
import
it is u
purpos
Chanc
this ar
Anato

F
Unive
plan a
been a
fund;
these
Medic
nance
anato
about
was e
versit
neces
dispe

pains to explain the exceptional character of the lease ; and it is a fact that several of the gentlemen present, including even the Bursar, who had signed the lease, did not understand its very peculiar features. Here again, as in the case of the Anatomical building, we observe the same objectionable system of secrecy as regards the Senate, which was not only not consulted, but was not even informed of the arrangements made in its name, nor even requested to exercise the powers with which it is invested. Mr. Mulock now informs us that this hospital scheme, with all that it implies, was formulated and endorsed by him four or five years ago, and yet during all that time, although it involved a greater departure in University policy than was ever dreamed of by the authorities, he studiously avoided submitting the matter to the judgment of the Senate.

With regard to the action of the Senate at their last meeting, we imagine that it was their desire to limit their finding to a vindication of the Vice-Chancellor. Whilst we can understand and to some extent sympathize with such a feeling, we think it proper to observe that such a body has a public trust to administer, and that its duties to the public must be performed, even if they are unpleasant. With regard to the Park Hospital difficulties—involving the hospital scheme proper in its present hopeless plight and the various protests connected with the lease of the College street lots—we are willing to believe that the Senate's action has been merely postponed by the resolution passed at the last meeting ; for no one, we trust, will seriously contend that that body has not an important duty still to perform, when the existence of these difficulties has been so readily recognized by the Hospital Board and the University Trustees (both of whom have appointed committees to confer with a committee of the Senate), as well as by the Minister of Education, and even by Mr. Mulock himself.

UNIVERSITY MEDICAL FACULTY.

Editorial of the Toronto Mail, June 16th, 1892 :

On the explanation given by the Chancellor in his Commencement Address with regard to the arrangements made to settle the difficulties created by Vice-Chancellor Mulock in erecting the Anatomical building, and in seizing examination and other fees.

In our editorial of Monday last on Mr. Blake's address we were obliged to omit all reference to his interesting statements concerning the reorganization of the Medical Faculty and its future prospects, as also to his important explanations regarding the action of the Government on the question of examination and degree fees, and on the Anatomical building difficulty. As the subject of the reorganization of the staff and the important improvements effected thereby was lately discussed at length in these columns, it is unnecessary to recur to the matter now. As to the contemplated changes for the purpose of securing better clinical facilities at the Toronto General Hospital, to which the Chancellor alluded, we propose to deal with that subject at an early day, and so devote this article mainly to the remaining questions relating to fees and the accommodation for Anatomical teaching.

From the letters of Dr. Geikie, and from the changes that were going on at the University, it was apparent that some influences were at work modifying the original plan as to fees and the Anatomical building. The examination and degree fees which had been appropriated for the support of the Medical Faculty had been restored to the general fund ; the fees for instruction in Arts had been dealt with in similar fashion ; both of these withdrawals having the effect, of course, of largely diminishing the resources of the Medical Faculty. Moreover, a very considerable rent, amounting with costs of maintenance to about \$2,000 a year, had been charged to the Medical Faculty for the use of the anatomical building, which was originally intended to be given freely. How all this came about was merely the subject of rumour and conjecture, and of misconception too ; for it was even represented that hostility to the Medical Faculty on the part of influential University men had caused these changes. It was, therefore, not only fitting but absolutely necessary that a public and authoritative statement should be made showing the truth and dispelling all doubts about these matters. In fact the University is a public institution ;

it must live in the light of day; it cannot hope to escape public criticism; and the advantages it possesses in connection with its State support involve a correlative liability to let the public know of its concerns. Now what were the facts? As to the fees it is now clear, as appears from the Order-in-Council, that no part of the expenses of the Medical Faculty were to be paid out of the University funds or fees, and it is simply incomprehensible how, under these circumstances, the examination and degree fees, as well as the instruction fees in Arts subjects, were ever seized for medical purposes. Such an appropriation, it is quite clear, was wrongful, contrary to the Order-in-Council and opposed to the declared policy of the Government. As to the Anatomical building the case is equally clear. According to the authoritative statement of the Chancellor, it now appears that the Government approved of the plans of the addition to the Biological building for the purposes of the University Science departments, and obtained the assent of the Legislature to the requisite appropriation for this specific object; that they were never told or imagined that any part of the building was intended for any other purpose, such as the teaching of Anatomy; that they had declared to the Legislature that the establishment of the Medical Faculty should be no charge on the University funds or endowment; and that as soon as they learned that the authority they gave and the assent they procured had been used for the purposes of the Medical Faculty, they had no other alternative but to insist on a change. This was not a question of policy in the sense that the Government was asked and refused to consent to an expenditure for these purposes. On the contrary it was simply a question of common honesty, and their clear duty to the Legislature required that they should make their pledges good. It was no part of the Chancellor's duty to enter into the controversy ventilated in these columns as to the person or persons responsible for these complications and for the unauthorized acts which produced them. His duty was limited to an explanation of the action of the Government, as communicated to him, and his own action taken on behalf of the University at the request of the Government. He made it clear that the Government had no alternative under the circumstances but to call for these changes, and that he had no alternative but to arrange the matter with as little detriment to existing plans and interests as possible. Disturbance and difficulties doubtless there were; but for these neither the Government nor the Chancellor was responsible. Who was is a matter we do not now touch on. It is, of course, obvious that the necessary rearrangement was difficult and embarrassing, and might have been destructive of the Medical Faculty. Who shall say what judicious plans might not have been devised had the truth of the case been declared to the framers of the Medical Faculty scheme? As it is, it is fortunate indeed that the Faculty survived the difficulties imposed on it by an unhappy and mistaken policy, and has even, under the impulse of the new organization, gained added strength and vigour.

We can now well understand that, as the Chancellor says, a very large portion of his time has been devoted to efforts to disentangle the complications in which unauthorized measures and the secret methods of accomplishing them had involved the institution. It is a pity that so much valuable time and energy should not have been employed in working out the unsolved problems of educational reform, and in strengthening and perfecting the weaker parts of our ever-expanding University system.

CRITICISM OF THE VICE-CHANCELLOR'S DEFENCE.

LETTER No. 1.

To the Editor of the Mail.

SIR,—I desire, with your permission, to make some observations on the defence offered by Vice-Chancellor Mulock of his action in the erection of the University Anatomical building. Inquiry in this matter is not, I hope, at an end; for the Vice-Chancellor has made some statements which demand further elucidation, notably in connection with his attempt to make the Minister of Education responsible for the failure to provide adequate accommodation in 1889 for Mineralogy and Geology.

1. M
of the bui
of Mines
and Geolo
March, 188
to point o
such a cha
course, at
purposes o
Wright, a
for Anato
assigned t
the lectur
and Geolo
one-sixth
The so-cal
of the libe
ostensibly
significant
attempt to
that there
provision
for Anato

2. W
absence o
would say
that he is
him to de
the Mini
Science, v
of Miner
until long
Mulock, t
Senate wa
the Univ
"the Gov
the Prov
possibilit
of the M
that cou
known to
when the
to the w
Science v
no provis
new arra
tical Sci
proposed

3.
Educati
Chemist
and Ana
Chemica
departm
of Educa
that he
of addi
ties of

1. Mr. Mulock commences by saying "that there was a change in the proposed use of the building," because of the intention of the Minister of Education to establish a School of Mines "which should relieve the University of any expense in respect of Mineralogy and Geology." Now, lest it may be imagined that there was originally, on the plans of March, 1889, adequate provision for Mineralogy and Geology, and none for Anatomy, I wish to point out that the very opposite was the case, and therefore there could not have been such a change as Mr. Mulock's statement seems to imply. This was not apparent, of course, at the time the plans were submitted to the Trustees; but lately, I understand, the purposes of the unmarked rooms on those plans have been indicated by Professor Ramsay Wright, and these indications prove that whilst there was ample accommodation provided for Anatomy (almost as much, indeed, as in the amended plans of October, 1889), the space assigned to Mineralogy and Geology was ridiculously small. I understand, in fact, that if the lecture-room, which though designed for Anatomy, was also to be used for Mineralogy and Geology be excluded, the whole space allotted to the latter department was only about one-sixth of what a Select Senate Committee deemed to be the minimum requirement. The so-called change, therefore, to which Mr. Mulock refers, simply amounted to an increase of the liberal accommodation previously arranged for Anatomy by the absurdly small space ostensibly set apart for Mineralogy and Geology. In the face of this fact, and the equally significant one that there was no consultation with Professor Chapman, and apparently no attempt to find out from experts the requirements of the department, will any one pretend that there was any serious intention on the part of the Vice-Chancellor to make adequate provision for Mineralogy and Geology, unless he could at the same time provide liberally for Anatomy?

2. With regard to the alleged interposition of the Minister of Education, in the absence of a statement from him, I must speak "subject to correction," as Mr. Mulock would say. Certain facts go to show that the latter's memory may be at fault here, and that he is in this case possibly giving to another, as his generous nature sometimes prompts him to do, the credit which is entirely and inconveniently his own. It is quite true that the Minister of Education had some plan in connection with the School of Practical Science, which might possibly have relieved the University in connection with the teaching of Mineralogy and Geology; but, so far as I can learn, he did not entertain this scheme until long after the summer of 1889, when the alleged change of plans, referred to by Mr. Mulock, took place. On this point I refer to the well known fact that a committee of the Senate was appointed in January, 1891, to enquire into the revenues and requirements of the University; and in the course of their labours, it was learned for the first time that "the Government had in contemplation the recognition of the great mineral interests of the Province by the creation of a School of Mines," and it was suggested that there was a possibility of the University and the School of Practical Science co-operating in the work of the Mineralogical and Geological department. Now, as Mr. Mulock was a member of that committee, it is just possible that he is attributing the views which the Minister is known to have entertained at that time (1891), to that earlier and rather indefinite period when the change to Anatomy was decided on. In support of this theory, I may also refer to the well-known facts, (1) that the plans for the addition to the School of Practical Science were made before July, 1889, when building operations were begun; and (2) that no provision was made in the new structure for teaching Mineralogy and Geology. In fact, no new arrangements for that department were made by the Minister in the School of Practical Science, until about two years after the time when, as Mr. Mulock alleges, he proposed his plan of a School of Mines.

3. But supposing that he is not guilty of an anachronism, and that the Minister of Education did intervene, as alleged, will the Vice-Chancellor explain why in that case Chemistry was not provided for, seeing that it was included in the executive authorization, and Anatomy was not? Had this course been followed, the money recently set apart for a Chemical Laboratory, would now be available for Mineralogy and Geology, and the latter department would not now be *in extremis*. As it has never been hinted that the Minister of Education authorized the change to Anatomy, it follows on Mr. Mulock's own showing that he took the unauthorized steps, firstly, of providing for that subject; and secondly, of adding to that provision, and these steps make him responsible for the present difficulties of Mineralogy and Geology.

4. The next point touched on in the defence is the omission from the plans of the names of the Anatomical rooms. This, the Vice-Chancellor says, was done by the Architect on his instructions "because of the possibility of objection being made by residents in the neighbourhood," and by Dr. Geikie, who, it was feared, "would seize hold of the dissecting room feature and use it with the public with increased effect." Now, granting that it was expedient to conceal the real character of the plans from the neighbours and from Dr. Geikie, there remain the more important questions which Mr. Mulock completely ignores: Why were the Anatomical names omitted from the original plans which were seen only by the Trustees and the Government? Why were not the final plans which were submitted to the Government honestly explained? But one answer can be given to these questions, and that is, that the main reason for the omission was to keep the Government in ignorance until the building was completed, in the hope that free occupation would be allowed when it was found that the building could not be advantageously used for the scientific department.

5. Unsatisfactory and lame as is the Vice-Chancellor's excuse for omitting the names in the plans, his attempt to justify the work is even more so. "I regarded," he says, "the action of the Legislature and the Senate in re-establishing the Faculty of Medicine as carrying with it the obligation to provide facilities for its maintenance." Now, no one knows better than Mr. Mulock, who is a member of Parliament, that the Legislature, like the Senate, has one and only one recognized mode of discharging its obligations. In the present case that obligation, which was declared by formal resolution, was to erect a building "for the Science departments of the University." Was Mr. Mulock then justified in erecting one for Anatomy instead? If the Legislature authorized an expenditure on a Chemical laboratory, would Mr. Mulock be justified in spending the money on a residence or on a Law School? Is the fancied existence in Mr. Mulock's mind of an obligation to supersede a solemn engagement sanctioned by the Government and the Legislature? But the Vice-Chancellor knew perfectly well, as everybody else did, that no such obligation as he suggests did exist; and this fact was made clear at the time the Medical Faculty was established in 1887, by the Order-in-Council, which provided that "in no case shall the Bursar certify to the payment of any expense whatever incurred on account of the said Medical Faculty from any of the trust funds, endowment, or other fees received by the University of Toronto, except such as arise from the establishment of the Medical Faculty."

6. In further justification of his action, Mr. Mulock says that "he does not think there exists in University circles any opposition to his scheme; and that such an attitude was never assumed until after the completion of the building." Now, why did he not explain that the real reason for the absence of opposition was that his scheme was kept a profound secret from the University—being known, so far as I can learn, only to himself, Professor Ramsay Wright and Dr. A. H. Wright? Moreover, any suspicions which may have been entertained at the University were lulled by the announcement of the Government, who, believing that their instructions were being strictly carried out with regard to the building operations, publicly stated on the floor of the House (*vide Mail*, March 14, 1890) that "there had been no charge for Medical Education whatever, and no money was being so expended;" and further, "that not one dollar of the public funds was expended for the purpose of giving a professional education to students attending the University." Similar statements were made by the Minister of Education in a letter to Dr. Geikie on March 11th, 1890, although the Anatomical building was then in process of erection; and yet, in the face of these public denials, Mr. Mulock maintained a guilty silence until the end.

7. If the University, having been kept in total ignorance, might be said to be "of one mind" as to his policy before the completion of the building, Mr. Mulock will admit, I presume, that such was not the case after that event, when it was no longer possible to preserve his secret. As to the reasonableness of such opposition, if anyone entertains a doubt, I would recommend him to read the Chancellor's recent address, in which an authoritative and impartial statement is given of the action taken by the Government on learning that the Biological building addition contained accommodation for Anatomy

8. For the Government on payment "came to" is now being the will of means to i rental, he and was th As to his ask what i imagine th suppose th and public in which h not for a r Governme reasons wh

TORONTO,

SIR,—
defence, a
action in o
of the Par
knowledge
for medica

9. In
of valuable
ments in 1
successfull
Anatomy
Governme
had deceiv
final adopt
like Mr. M
departmen
tion, if ne
he did use
to allow t
for Clinica
from 1887
that, even
tion of the
been the s
to attach
cellor?—a
Governme
equally do
two mont
money ha

10. I
himself,

8. From the Chancellor's explanations it appears that after considerable negotiation the Government finally consented to the building being occupied by the Medical Faculty on payment of a substantial rent. The charging of an occupation rent, says Mr. Mulock, "came to him as a surprise, and it is in deference to other opinion than his own that rent is now being charged." It is satisfactory to learn that a gentleman who did not respect the will of the Government and the Legislature, eventually did defer to somebody. If he means to imply, however, that the Government or anyone else forced him to agree to a rental, he is in error, for the suggestion of this course came, I understand, from himself, and was the best possible solution of the difficulty into which he had led the University. As to his alleged surprise at the opposition to his plan of giving free occupation, may I ask what attitude did he expect the Government and the Legislature to take? Did he imagine that they would condemn their own previous action and approve of his? Did he suppose that they would "record their appreciation of his action" in leaving "the straight and public road," which they directed him to follow, for "the crooked and covered way" in which he apparently delights to tread? That he had any such great expectations I do not for a moment believe, and hence I suspect that his surprise at the attitude of the Government was about as genuine as the lame excuses, the affected beliefs and futile reasons which characterize his defence.

Yours, etc.,

J. S.

TORONTO, June 30.

LETTER No. 2.

To the Editor of the Mail.

SIR,—With your permission I resume the further consideration of Mr. Mulock's defence, and propose in the present communication to deal more particularly with his action in obtaining from the University Endowment the College street lots for the benefit of the Park Hospital, and attempting at the same time to commit the Senate, without its knowledge, to an unknown expenditure for erecting, equipping and maintaining buildings for medical teaching.

9. In order to understand how it was possible for him, in 1890, to effect the alienation of valuable property for such a purpose, it will be necessary to recall some of his achievements in 1889, in connection with the Anatomical building plans. In the first place, he had successfully concealed from the University Trustees from March onwards the fact that Anatomy was being provided for; in the second place, he had succeeded in getting the Government's sanction for \$60,000 in spite of the protest of his co-trustees; and thirdly, he had deceived the Minister of Education as to the plans in blank which were submitted for final adoption by the Government. With such an encouraging series of successes, an adept like Mr. Mulock was not to be balked from finishing his plans of providing for all the other departments of the Medical Faculty, *coûte que coûte*. That he was prepared to use deception, if necessary, his conduct in the case of the Anatomical building amply proves. That he did use deception of some kind is manifest from the Government's well-known refusal to allow the University to spend a dollar for ordinary medical teaching purposes, still less for Clinical teaching in connection with a hospital. In fact, the Government's attitude from 1887 onwards was so decided on this question of the support of the Medical Faculty that, even if the Senate and the Board of Trustees had joined in a unanimous recommendation of the lease of the College street property to the Park Hospital, there would not have been the slightest hope of obtaining the consent of the Executive. What value, then, are we to attach to an alleged approval of the lease, obtained by some artifice of the Vice-Chancellor?—an approval about as valuable as that secured by him when he submitted to the Government the blank plans of the Anatomical building. That the Government were equally deceived in both cases plainly appears from their public declaration made about two months after the execution of the lease, to the effect that not one dollar of the public money had been, or was being, spent for medical teaching purposes (see sec. 6).

10. But let us hear Mr. Mulock, who, instead of beginning with the charges against himself, "takes the liberty of presenting to us in detail the history of the Park Hospital

scheme." The first point worthy of note in this tedious account is his reference to the establishment of the Law Faculty, the appointments in which, he incidentally remarks, "are a charge on the general resources of the University." Such a statement, if uncorrected and unexplained, is, of course, calculated to create the impression that there is as much reason for supporting the Medical Faculty out of University funds as for paying the professors or constitutional law and jurisprudence, and, accordingly, I would direct attention to that part of the Chancellor's commencement address wherein he shows that these so-called Law subjects are really subjects which the University Act places in the same category as Latin, Mathematics and other branches of the Arts course, and that no provision exists for paying the lecturers on purely professional subjects out of University funds.

11. With regard to Mr. Macdonald's proposal, in 1887, to establish the hospital, it seems that that gentleman wrote a letter about the matter to Mr. Mulock, and that somebody (presumably Mr. Mulock) submitted a draft agreement to the Trustees, who thereupon passed a resolution of thanks. Speaking of these proceedings, Mr. Mulock says: "From a perusal of the draft agreement and letter and resolution the Senate will understand that the Board of Trustees accepted Mr. Macdonald's gift on the terms, amongst others, that the University was to provide the site." Now, as neither Mr. Macdonald's letter nor a blank agreement could possibly bind the Trustees, their undertaking, if it existed, to provide a site would be in their published resolution. But I have looked in vain for it, and have come to the conclusion that the undertaking in question was about as mythical as that of the citizens of Toronto on whose behalf the Trustees gratefully acknowledged the generous offer of Mr. Macdonald. And in so abstaining from giving any such undertaking the Board evidently realized the fact that it was not within its power to do so.

12. In connection with the proceedings of the five or six gentlemen who practically constituted the Board of the Park Hospital, it is curious to notice the extraordinary amount of formality observed by them, as evidenced by the lengthy account which Mr. Mulock gives of some of their proceedings. Whilst this tedious recital serves the obvious purpose of leading readers away from the real question, it fortunately proves to us that had these gentlemen intended to give such undertaking as Mr. Mulock asserts they did, they would have indicated their intentions in the most formal manner, as would become a body so mindful of the necessity for formality in their proceedings.

13. Let me now explain the position of the College street lots before they were seized by Mr. Mulock for the hospital. From his own statement it appears that Wycliffe College desired to lease these two lots, and claimed that she was entitled "to have some consideration in regard thereto," but "that the University Board was not prepared to assent to" their claim. This was the situation in 1887, when, *presto!* the lots in question were withdrawn from the control of the Trustees by the Government. Now observe the assumed uncertainty of Mr. Mulock in referring to this act. A communication came "he thinks from the Minister of Education" about the matter; "he does not speak with positiveness as to the tenor of this letter," but merely says that it "created the impression on his mind that the disposition of these lots was really withdrawn from the Board."* Now what is all this cloudy talk intended to conceal? That it was Mr. Mulock who overrode the Trustees by getting the Minister to intervene in the matter. That this act was Mr. Mulock's is indeed evident, (1) because we now know that in March, 1889, he overrode his co-Trustees in a similar manner in connection with the proposed expenditure of \$60,000 for building purposes, and (2) because there was no one but Mr. Mulock to do the act, and no one else who had any ulterior plans which called for such tactics.

14. What then was the situation at this time (November, 1887)? Mr. Macdonald's proposal to give \$40,000 to found a hospital had been made. Whatever may have been the private understanding between him and Mr. Mulock, the University Trustees certainly had made no offer of a free site, as indeed they would not have been justified in doing without the sanction of the Government, whose Trustees they were. As to the College street lots, they had been withdrawn from the control of the Board clearly at the instiga-

*By referring to the Bursar's statement, page —, it will be seen that Mr. Mulock is incorrect as to the purport of the Minister's letter, which merely asked the Board to "defer consideration of applications of parties to lease" these lots. This request Mr. Mulock distorts into a withdrawal from the control of the Trustees whom he accordingly had ignored.

tion of
carry out

15.
College
"the at
whatever
is "not
selected
remaine
months

16.
lease of
transact
of the V
(2) the
the Coll
observe
time as
which h
justified
regard
delayed
failure t
who had
for the
selected
these pr
Mulock
connecti

17.
given hi
no one v
the Med
and rep
included
Minister
from the
by getti

18.
more m
fore it i
stand, a
tion. V
getting
plain d
upward
commit

19
Mr. Mu
present.
line to
details
us that
"havin
the ma
scheme

reference to the
y remarks, "an
uncorrected and
as much reason
the professors or
tion to that part
ed Law subjects
s Latin, Mathe-
for paying the

the hospital, it
and that some-
, who thereupon
k says: "From
understand that
others, that the
ter nor a blank
to provide a site
and have come
as that of the
e generous offer
king the Board

who practically
rdinary amount
ch Mr. Mulock
obvious purpose
that had these
lid, they would
come a body so

they were seized
ycliffe College
some considera-
l to assent to"
tion were with-
ve the assumed
ne "he thinks
th positiveness
on on his mind
Now what is all
le the Trustees
r. Mulock's is
his co-Trustees
00 for building
and no one else

r. Macdonald's
may have been
stees certainly
stified in doing
to the College
at the instiga-

is incorrect as to
ation of applica-
drawal from the

tion of Mr. Mulock, who was thus independent of the Trustees when the time came to carry out his schemes with regard to the lots in question.

15. And now ensued a very considerable delay before the purchase of Wycliffe College by the Park Hospital Trustees. During this period, as Mr. Mulock informs us, "the attitude of the University Board towards the proposal was one of general approval," whatever that very indefinite statement may mean. Mr. Mulock also informs us that he is "not aware of having ever heard any objection to the proposal as to the site finally selected," which is extremely probable, seeing that the exact nature of the proposal remained a profound secret, and only became known, even to the authorities, a few months ago.

16. Before adverting to the so-called approval by the Minister of Education of the lease of the College street lots, I wish to direct attention to the fact that there were three transactions which were put through by Mr. Mulock at the same time: (1) The transfer of the Wycliffe College and site from Wycliffe College to the Park Hospital for \$60,000, (2) the lease of the new site by the University to Wycliffe College, and (3) the lease of the College street lots by the University to the Park Hospital. Now, it is important to observe that the Minister was asked to approve of all three transactions at the same time as a matter of great urgency. Mr. Mulock says that after discussion, the purport of which he is careful not to give, "the Minister agreed with him that they would not be justified in adopting any course that involved delay." Now, whilst this may be true with regard to the first transaction, it does not appear why the last could not have been delayed for mature consideration. Delay in this case would have meant, of course, certain failure to secure the College street lots, and this is probably the reason why Mr. Mulock, who had all the details of his scheme carefully worked out, took care to lump his requests for the Minister's approval. Indeed, the fact that the new site of Wycliffe had been selected, and the complicated terms of the lease arranged, shows that the settlement of these preliminaries was the work of weeks, if not of months, and goes to prove that Mr. Mulock purposely waited for some occasion on which he could repeat his achievements in connection with the blank plans of the Anatomical building.

17. That the Minister gave the desired approvals we know. That he would have given his assent in the case of the College street lots had he understood the transaction no one will pretend who knows what the avowed policy of the Government was towards the Medical Faculty, or who recalls the solemn declarations the Minister made in 1887, and repeated frequently, or who is aware of the astonishment of everyone, the Minister included, on discovering the extraordinary nature of this transaction. Further, that the Minister was misled, and that Mr. Mulock was capable of misleading him, we can infer from the fact that the latter had a few weeks before closed a successful series of deceptions by getting the Minister's approval of the blank plans for the Anatomical building.

18. What Mr. Mulock said to hoodwink the Minister in this matter is really not more material than what he said in the case of the Anatomical building plans, and therefore it is not necessary to dwell on the Minister's statement that he was given to understand, amongst other things, that the University Trustees had approved of the transaction. What is material, however, is the undoubted fact that Mr. Mulock did not, when getting the Minister's approval in an alleged case of urgency, clearly explain, as was his plain duty, that the University was giving, and the Government approving of giving, upwards of \$75,000 for Clinical teaching; and, further, that the Government was possibly committing the University to a further indefinite expenditure for like purposes.

19. The Minister's approval was obtained on January 4, 1890, and on January 7 Mr. Mulock presents a lengthy report to the Park Hospital Trustees, five members being present, in which he devotes fifty-six lines to transaction No. 1 above referred to, and one line to the matter of the College street lots. In this document, which is so overloaded with details about the former matter that the latter is completely hidden, Mr. Mulock informs us that he undertook to act on his own responsibility in the former transaction without "having obtained previous authority" from his colleagues, because "there was danger of the matter receiving publicity, which might perhaps endanger the carrying out of the scheme." As to the lease of the College street lots, it is significant that he takes care

to make no remarks or to direct attention to the matter. At the same meeting (January 7) Mr. Mulock informs us that one gentleman "spoke in the warmest terms of his course," and that "his remarks were endorsed" by the other three. If this indefinite approval referred to the part he took in securing Wycliffe College for the Park Hospital, the statement is possibly correct; but even Mr. Mulock will not dare to say that these complimentary remarks applied to the course he took in order to secure the Minister's signature to the lease of the College street lots. Nor will the laudations of any of Mr. Mulock's friends affect the public verdict as to the main charge in this connection, which is that by deception of some kind he got the Minister of Education to transfer the College street property to the Park Hospital Trustees.

20. It will be observed that the Minister's "approval" of the lease practically settled the transaction, and no subsequent action on the part of Mr. Mulock's four co-Trustees could affect the matter. When, therefore, Mr. Mulock triumphantly produces a minute of the University Board of January 9th to apparently prove that these same gentlemen, being members of both Boards, approved of the same three transactions referred to above, it is sufficient to point out that so far as the College street lots were concerned Mr. Mulock was asking them to engage in a farce, (1) because the transaction was closed two days before, and subsequent approval could have no meaning or effect, and (2) because he had nearly three years before got the Minister of Education to send a communication, the effect of which, he says, was to withdraw the disposition of the lots from the Board. In fact this former action of his relieves his colleagues of all responsibility in this matter, for there is no pretence that they were ever consulted as to the disposition of these particular lots before they were finally transferred to the Park Hospital by the Minister on January 4, 1890.

21. And now let us examine the main provisions of the lease which Mr. Mulock contends "show that the interests of the University have been carefully considered." In the first place, the term is for 999 years, whereas the usual terms in all other cases have been twenty-one and forty-two years. In the second place, the University Senate has the right, in addition to that of electing the successors of the original Trustees, "to erect and maintain" on the said lands buildings for medical teaching purposes, and for these doubtful privileges the University is to receive the fees which students may pay for Clinical instruction in the Park Hospital.

22. With regard to the financial aspect of the transaction, Mr. "Mulock ventures to assert that if the scheme is not impaired the University will in due course, by way of rent, receive from fees quite as much money, if not more, than she could realize either by selling or leasing the land." Now I am not going at present to discuss this rather venturesome assertion, but I will ask: (1) Does Mr. Mulock invest any of his own money in the hospital business? (2) Why was the proposal to enquire into the merits of the scheme so strenuously resisted if they were such as he asserts? (3) Why are the strictures of Dr. Geikie, who says that Mr. Mulock's scheme "would swallow up most of the University's annual income," not answered?

23. Moreover, with regard to the alleged exclusive privileges to be enjoyed by the University, what has he got to say in answer to Drs. Geikie, Ryerson and Grasett, who affirm that "it was Mr. Macdonald's intention and express wish and determination to have Trinity Medical College and the University of Toronto equally represented" on the staff of the hospital? If so, then it would appear that Mr. Mulock is also open to the very serious charge of taking advantage of Mr. Macdonald's helpless condition, and of arranging the terms of the lease to suit his own views. In the interests of the University so serious a charge as this should not be allowed to rest unanswered.

24. But the question I have now to deal with is, as already hinted, not the merits of the hospital scheme, but the further charge against the Vice-Chancellor that without the knowledge of the Senate he undertook to commit them to the dangerous course of taking a leap in the dark in connection with hospital teaching and maintenance. This he himself confesses he did in 1887, when he arranged with Mr. Macdonald the terms of the proposed "Amy Macdonald" Hospital; and again, in 1890, when he incorporated in the lease of the College street lots provisions intended to commit the Senate to the project of

erecting
no other
he main
present
Faculty

25.
in conu
Univers
their co
Educati
explain
Senate
further
that in
Macdon

26.
attempt
in the v
audace
disquisi
wrongfu
be rega
which a
scientific
allies m
having
sufficient
against
between
destruct
congeni

27.
that the
those,"
the Uni
tion."
voted in
building
departm
ation st
the fed
depart
faith in
been hi
object
blank p
it hono
And w
either
ill" an

T

meeting (January
of his course,"
definite approval
hospital, the state-
these compliment-
ter's signature to
of Mr. Mulock's
which is that by
the College street

practically settled
four co-Trustees
duces a minute
same gentlemen,
ions referred to
e concerned Mr.
was closed two
(2) because he
communication, the
the Board. In
in this matter,
on of these par-
the Minister on

ich Mr. Mulock
considered." In
other cases have
sity Senate has
stees, "to erect
es, and for these
pay for Clinical

lock ventures to
way of rent, re-
either by selling
er venturesome
ney in the hos-
the scheme so
ne strictures of
of the Univer-

enjoyed by the
l Grasett, who
etermination to
esented" on the
also open to the
dition, and of
the University

ot the merits of
at without the
course of taking
This he himself
terms of the
rporated in the
o the project of

erecting medical buildings and engaging in Clinical teaching. And further, if there was no other evidence of his culpability in this matter, we have sufficient proof in the fact that he maintained a guilty silence for years until a chance enquiry in the Senate led to the present revelations and disclosed the secret game he had been long playing to rob the Arts Faculty and to saddle the University with the support of the Medical Faculty.

25. Let me now restate what I consider to be the main charges against Mr. Mulock in connection with the Park Hospital scheme. The first is, that he overrode the University Trustees by getting the College street lots, as he says, "withdrawn from" their control in 1887. The second is, that he obtained the approval of the Minister of Education to the alienation of these lots by misrepresentations and by culpable failure to explain the nature of the transaction. The third is, that he usurped the powers of the Senate and of the Government in arranging the terms of the lease. And there is now the further serious charge involved in the declarations of Drs. Geikie, Ryerson and Grasett, that in arranging these terms he was apparently guilty of a breach of faith with Mr. Macdonald when that gentleman was on his death-bed.

26. Neither in his defence to the Senate nor since its appearance has Mr. Mulock attempted to answer these charges. Indeed, he has unblushingly avoided them, confident in the virtues of his guiding motto: "*De l'audace, encore de l'audace, et toujours de l'audace.*" Acting in accordance with this maxim, he has treated us to a long and irrelevant disquisition about the rise and fall of the Park Hospital scheme. The charges against his wrongful acts he distorts into an attack upon that scheme, which assault, he says, "will be regarded as aimed at our Medical Faculty." He raises visions of sanguinary encounters which are to follow when "the literary side of the University arms itself against the scientific, and the Arts Faculty against the Medical," and "when each shall seek their allies amongst our confederated and affiliated Universities and Colleges," "a state of affairs" having "but one end, the destruction of the University." In answer to which it is sufficient to say that the literary and scientific departments have united in protesting against his act in alienating the College street property; that there is the utmost harmony between the Arts and Medical Faculties; and that the University is perfectly safe from destruction so long as Mr. Mulock is not permitted to direct its policy, or to continue his congenial work of fomenting internal dissensions.

27. Let me, in conclusion, direct attention to Mr. Mulock's unscrupulous suggestion that there exists a disposition to violate the terms of Confederation. "I would remind those," he says, "who seek to make a point against the development of the Science side of the University, that the University must keep faith with those who endorsed Confederation." Now, in the first place, who but Mr. Mulock diverted the money which was voted in March, 1889, for the Science departments to the erection of the Anatomical building, and who but Mr. Mulock thereby arrested the development of the Geological department? Secondly, what are the Science departments whose development Confederation still requires, if they are not Chemistry and Mineralogy and Geology? And who are the federationists who maintain that Anatomy and hospital work belong to the Science departments of the University? But when Mr. Mulock suggests the existence of bad faith in others, he should draw the line before hinting that integrity and uprightness have been his besetting virtues. "Every action of the University," he says, "should be an object lesson of what is honourable and true." Was it then honourable and true to submit blank plans for Anatomy, when Confederation required Mineralogy and Geology? Was it honourable to endow a hospital when Confederation required a Chemical Laboratory? And who are the federationists or anti-federationists who will dare to say that it was either honourable or true to take the money of a philanthropist who was "dangerously ill" and disregard his wishes?

Yours, etc.,

J. S.

TORONTO, July 8.

**ACTION OF THE UNIVERSITY COLLEGE ALUMNI ASSOCIATION,
JUNE 10TH, 1892.**

Moved by Dr. A. B. Macallum, B.A., Ph.D., seconded by Prof A. C. McKay, M.A. (professor in McMaster University), and carried: "That in view of the action of the Park Hospital Trustees in appointing the Vice-Chancellor and Dr. Hoskin, and also of the University Trustees in appointing the Chancellor and Prof. Loudon, committees to meet with a Committee of the Senate for the purpose of conferring about the difficulties which have arisen about the lease of the College street lots, and about the present unsatisfactory condition of the Park Hospital scheme, and in view of the expressed desire of the Minister of Education to facilitate a settlement of the difficulties in question, this Association deems it expedient to express the hope that the steps so taken towards arranging for a conference on these important matters will be followed at an early date by corresponding action on the part of the Senate."

THE UNIVERSITY SENATE.

To the Editor of The Mail.

SIR,—In to-day's issue of the *Mail* Mr. Walter Barwick publishes a manifesto on the subject of the University Senate Elections, in which he makes some extraordinary assertions regarding myself, and I take the opportunity offered by your columns of drawing his attention to these misstatements, and to the advisability of his making the necessary corrections. In this manifesto he says:—

"A number of the lecturers in the college came to the conclusion that they should in the interests of their departments be made professors, and conceived the idea that a resolution of the Senate recommending their appointment would secure the desired result. After nearly a year's log-rolling, a resolution was, in the fall of 1890, submitted to the Senate, recommending that the following college lecturers, namely, Messrs. Dale, Squair, Fraser, VanderSmitten and Dr. A. B. Macallum be appointed professors."

Also again:—

"The interests of the University are not to be promoted by men who would go to the Senate with personal interests of their own to serve. Mr. Dale aims at being appointed to one office, Mr. VanderSmitten to another, Mr. Squair to a third, Mr. Fraser to a fourth, Dr. A. B. Macallum to a fifth."

He speaks further of "skill in log-rolling, combining, etc., taking the place of scholarship."

Now, as to my connection with the events in question. In 1890 several lecturers, of whom I was not one, applied for representation, but not for professorships, in the University and College Councils. This application went in due time before a committee appointed by the Senate from its members to consider it. This committee did so, and reported to the Senate that the memorialists should be given the rank of professors, which rank would entitle them to seats on the University and College Councils. Before the Senate adopted this report, Professor Ramsay Wright pressed me strongly to apply for the rank accorded by the report of the committee to the other lecturers, and when I definitely and decidedly refused to do so, he, of his own accord, moved in the Senate that my position also be taken into consideration. The committee, to which the whole was referred, recommended that I be made professor of physiology. I had no communication, official or otherwise, with the committee or with the Senate. I believe that Professor Wright's action was dictated by what he thought were the interests of his department.

She
by Mr.
gave me
was in c
sign thi
befell th

In
Chancell
Faculty,
position
arranged
reached
necessary
bringing
me some
the pres
humble c

Let
professor
or hinted
could ad
ambition
that I h
position.
to have

So
say that
of my co

I a
produces

Tom

Sir
occurre

"A
in the i
resoluti
After m
Senate,
Fraser,

In
Senate

"
Germa
represe

OCIATION,

McKay, M.A.
on of the Park
nd also of the
nttees to meet
fficulties which
unsatisfactory
of the Minister
ociation deems
or a conference
ding action on

Shortly after this two other lecturers, whose names are not among those enumerated by Mr. Barwick, asked me to sign with them a memorial for increase in salary, and they gave me to understand that if I signed it the Vice-Chancellor, with whom one of them was in communication, would be likely to consider it favourably. I decidedly refused to sign this or any similar memorial. Their application met with a fate like that which befell the report of the committee on the memorial of the other lecturers.

In October of last year, the committee of the Senate on the Medical Faculty, the Chancellor presiding, recommended that I be made professor of physiology in the Medical Faculty, and the Senate adopted the recommendation. That put me in the anomalous position of being professor in one faculty of the University while lecturer in another, an arrangement which I would be loath to accept had not matters in the Medical Faculty reached a stage in which some active interference on my part I considered absolutely necessary, and the appointment to a professorship gave me an opportunity for assisting in bringing about a considerably improved condition of affairs. This result has reconciled me somewhat to the position I occupy; but could I be convinced that the maintenance of the present satisfactory condition of affairs in the Medical Faculty did not require my humble efforts I would resign my professorship in it at once.

Let me repeat for Mr. Barwick's information: I have never asked or applied for a professorship or seat in the University Council or medical faculty. I have never intimated or hinted that I had any desire for the same. I have never entertained the idea that I could advance my interests by becoming a member of the Senate. Whether I have the ambition to be a professor in the Arts Faculty can hardly be Mr. Barwick's concern, seeing that I have never striven in any shape or fashion that he can be aware of to attain that position. Mr. Barwick, who has been regular in his attendance at Senate meetings, ought to have known the true state of affairs.

So grossly has he misjudged my motives that it appears to me almost unnecessary to say that the public ought to receive with reserve his views as to the motives and character of my colleagues.

I await Mr. Barwick's reply. I trust that whatever results the present contest produces it ought not to cause him to forget the gentleman's code—*noblesse oblige*.

Yours, etc.,

A. B. MACALLUM.

TORONTO, August 1.

would go to
ing appointed
Fraser to a

MR. BARWICK CALLED DOWN.

To the Editor of the Mail.

the place of

lecturers, of
the Univer-
tee appointed
reported to
rank would
mate adopted
rank accorded
nd decidedly
also be taken
mended that
erwise, with
was dictated

SIR,—In Monday's *Mail* appeared a letter from Mr. Walter Barwick, in which occurred the following:—

"A number of the lecturers in the College came to the conclusion that they should, in the interests of their departments, be made professors, and conceived the idea that a resolution of the Senate recommending their appointment would secure the desired result. After nearly a year's log-rolling, a resolution was, in the fall of 1890, submitted to the Senate, recommending that the following college lecturers, namely, Messrs. Dale, Squair, Fraser, VanderSmissen and Dr. A. B. Macallum be appointed professors."

In answer to this statement I append the following extracts from the proceedings of Senate:—

"October 16, 1890.—Letter from the lecturers in the departments of Latin, French, German, Italian and Spanish, asking the Senate to take into consideration the lack of representation in the University and College Councils of the above-named departments.

This letter was referred to a committee consisting of the Vice-Chancellor, the President, Principal Caven, Principal Galbraith, Mr. Embree, Prof. Loudon and Dr. Ellis."

At a subsequent meeting Principal Caven, who had been elected chairman, presented a report with the following findings:—

"1. The general subjects taught by the memorialists, whether in view of their importance, or of the number of students connected with them, have a valid claim to be represented on the University Council or on the Council of University College.

"2. The Committee has every reason to believe that the subjects or departments of Latin, French, German, Spanish and Italian, have been so efficiently conducted by the lecturers in charge of them as to establish the fitness of these gentlemen to be promoted to the rank of professors, thus entitling them to a place on the Council of the University or of University College. The Senate is therefore advised to recommend to the Government that the memorialists have this rank accorded to them."

On this report being presented, Prof. Ramsay Wright suggested that the name of Dr. A. B. Macallum be included in the recommendation. The report was accordingly referred back, and on November 20, 1890, was presented with the following addition:—

"The committee has given careful attention to the case of Dr. A. B. Macallum, remitted to it on presentation of its report on the memorial of the lecturers in Latin, French, German, Italian and Spanish, with the view of considering whether the recommendation made in regard to the lecturers on the above subjects should apply also to Dr. Macallum and the subject of physiology taught by him."

"The committee finds that the subject taught by Dr. Macallum is not in any such sense subordinate to biology as to make it improper or unnecessary that this subject should be represented on the Council of the University, and that there would be positive advantage in having it independently represented."

"The committee further has abundant evidence that Dr. Macallum has discharged his duties with much efficiency. It is therefore recommended to the Senate that the rank of professor shall be sought for Dr. Macallum as for the gentlemen teaching the subjects dealt with in the previous report."

On the motion for adoption the Chancellor proposed and carried the following amendment:—

"That the departments in question should be represented, and that the Government be requested to take such steps by amendatory legislation, the appointment of professors, or otherwise, as may accomplish the result."

I may add that no request for promotion to professorships came either to the Senate or the committee from these gentlemen, and that Dr. Macallum made no application whatsoever. The view taken by the Chancellor was that the Government should take the sole responsibility of making promotions or appointments in these cases, and that the Senate should not make a recommendation. It will be observed, however, that the application of the memorialists was carried. I hope Mr. Barwick will not require any suggestion as to the course he should now pursue in view of the inaccuracies in his statement.

Yours, etc.,

TORONTO, August 4.

J. GALBRAITH.

Sta.
affairs pe
committe
and Mr.
services
with the
Chancell

1. I
those wh
him and
Murphy,
say in a
those wh
however
that I sh
is that I
tion the
the arch
the Com
Mr. Mu
sizes the
way."
the man
to the m
justified
Mulock'
cap fits

2.
Chancel
that "in
Coyne a
of the to
Mr. Mu
no. Ca
transact
complic
again sa
in such
"shoul
after ap
addition
"it is n
of its p
building
to five
dially"

3. M
preven
standin
us that
moting

the President,
Ellis."

man, presented

view of their
did claim to be
lege.

departments of
ducted by the
o be promoted
the University
he Government

t the name of
as accordingly
g addition :-

Macallum, re-
Latin, French,
commendation
Dr. Macallum

it in any such
subject should
ositive advan

discharged his
at the rank of
the subjects

the following

e Government
of professors,

to the Senate
o application
t should take
and that the
hat the appli-
any sugges-
statement.

BRAITH.

UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS.

To the Editor of The Mail.

SIR,—I have to ask your permission for space to answer the manifesto on University affairs published in Monday's MAIL by Mr. Walter Barwick, in which he appears as a committee of one in the interest of certain gentlemen, prominent among whom are himself and Mr. Mulock, if I may judge from his complimentary references to the distinguished services of the pair—*par nobile fratrum*. It is to be regretted that Mr. Barwick in dealing with the important matters now before the University graduates resorts to the Vice-Chancellor's tactics of evading the real issues and misrepresenting his critics.

1. Mr. Barwick begins by complaining that in asking for help in "a crusade against those who practice or endorse crookedness in University administration," I was aiming at him and certain other gentlemen, viz., Mr. Justice Falconbridge, Prof. Baker, Mr. Mac-Murphy, Mr. Aylesworth, Mr. King, Mr. Coyne, and Mr. Barwick. To be brief, let me say in answer to this charge that my words had reference to the Vice-Chancellor and to those who endorse his administration of University affairs. Amongst the latter I do not, however, place Mr. Coyne or Mr. Aylesworth. As to Mr. Barwick, it is not necessary that I should define his position, as he has done so himself. What he objects to, I presume, is that I should apply the term 'crooked' to certain acts of Mr. Mulock. In justification thereof I have merely to point to the plain, unvarnished tales told by the Bursar and the architect and to the editorial comments of the press. I may also refer Mr. Barwick to the Commencement address of the Chancellor, in which, after giving a very full account of Mr. Mulock's dealings in the matter of the Anatomical building and certain fees, he emphasizes the importance in Senate administration of eschewing "the crooked and covered way." Does Mr. Barwick imagine that this reference of Mr. Blake's was directed against the man in the moon? In common with the whole University I think the reference was to the man at Mr. Barwick's elbow, viz., Mr. Mulock, and so I presume Mr. Barwick was justified in fitting the cap to his own head when I referred to those who endorsed Mr. Mulock's peculiar methods. Mr. Barwick, however, should not assume that because the cap fits him he must put it on the heads of Messrs. Coyne and Aylesworth.

2. In referring to the recently issued manifesto, in which the new policy of the Chancellor is defined and the old one of the Vice-Chancellor condemned, Mr. Barwick says that "in the main, everyone of the above seven graduates can subscribe" thereto. Messrs. Coyne and Aylesworth can do so, of course, but how can the others? Let us see how many of the ten planks Mr. Barwick can accept. Can he subscribe to No. 7, which condemns Mr. Mulock's action in the erection of the Anatomical building? His recorded vote says no. Can he subscribe to No. 8, which condemns Mr. Mulock's action in the Park hospital transaction? His recorded vote says no. Can he subscribe to No. 9, which says that the complications about the College street lots should be enquired into? His recorded vote again says no. Can Mr. Barwick, after endorsing Mr. Mulock's action in ignoring the Senate in such important matters, consistently subscribe to No. 5, which declares that the Senate "should be allowed the full exercise of its rightful functions?" No! Can Mr. Barwick after approving of Mr. Mulock's action in submitting the plans of the Biological Building addition to the trustees and not to the Senate consistently say, as declared in No. 6, that "it is manifestly not proper that the trustees should supersede the Senate in the exercise of its peculiar functions, as it was asked to do in the matter of the plans for the Biological building addition? Certainly not. If, then, Mr. Barwick cannot consistently subscribe to five out of the ten planks in the manifesto, is it proper for him to say that he can "cordially" support it in the main?

3. Mr. Barwick confesses that his arduous labours in connection with the library have prevented him "from becoming fully acquainted with University politics." Notwithstanding this confession of a slight lack in omniscience, Mr. Barwick proceeds to inform us that the University College Alumni Association was formed "for the purpose of promoting the interests of the college as against those of all other sections of the University."

Now, I am aware that his pretensions to omniscience in library matters cause some amusement in the faculty, but it is only after discovering the inaccuracies of his manifesto about University affairs that I fully appreciate why people sometimes smile. Now, why does Mr. Barwick omit all reference to the University and its faculty, in whose interest and that of University College the association is expressly stated to be formed? Mr. Barwick of course knows that there is a Medical Alumni Association, that there is also a Victoria College Alumni Association, and that there are similar associations in Knox and Wycliffe. He knows perfectly well that all these members of the University "had devised such a scheme," and that "such a sectional policy," as he calls it, is considered necessary and important in their case. Then why should he aver that such an association, when formed in the interests of the Arts Faculties of the College and University, is "calamitous"? I am afraid that his slight defect in omniscience in the domain of University politics is responsible for the absurd mistake committed by Mr. Barwick in this particular instance.

With your permission, I shall continue my criticism of Mr. Barwick's manifesto in a day or two.

Yours, etc.,

TORONTO, August 3rd, 1892.

J. SQUAIR.

UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS.—MR. BARWICK'S BLUNDERS.

To the Editor of the Mail.

SIR,—Will you kindly permit me to continue the criticism of Mr. Barwick's manifesto of last Monday, which I began in last Thursday's issue of your paper.

4. The next matter touched on by Mr. Barwick is the application of certain lecturers in the University to have their departments represented on the councils. On this subject Mr. Barwick has made so many misstatements that I observe he has been "called down" by Dr. Macallum, and also by Prof. Galbraith, who was a member of the committee to whom the application was referred. As to the charge of log-rolling in this connection it is not a new one, for it was made during the discussion by the Vice-Chancellor, who was compelled to apologize in the Senate by the chairman of the committee, Principal Caven.

With regard, however, to the application in question, although the justice of the claim was recognized, as shewn by Mr. Blake's resolution for which Mr. Barwick voted, it still remains an unaccomplished reform. In other words, the departments of Latin, French, German, Italian and Spanish, are still without representation on the councils of the College and University. As these councils send representatives in rotation to the Senate, it follows that the important departments in question are without representation on the Senate, and the only way left to secure such representation is to appeal to the graduates. That is why I am specially interested in the candidature of Messrs. Dale and vander-Smissen, to whom Mr. Barwick objects, although on general grounds these gentlemen will surely make quite as worthy representatives of the graduates as Mr. Barwick. One question, then, before the electors is this: Are the important departments of Latin, French, German, Italian and Spanish not as fully entitled to representation on the Senate as Mr. Barwick's firm, which is represented by Messrs. Moss, Barwick, Hoyles, and Aylesworth, and which can point to another Senator, Mr. Justice Falconbridge, as a recent partner. Why, sir, this firm, together with Mr. Mulock and his thick and thin supporters, Messrs. Marsh, Creelman, Baker, and Drs. A. H. Wright and Macfarlane, constitute a majority of the Senate at its ordinary meetings. Mr. Aylesworth excepted, these gentlemen constitute the real "combine" who are manipulated by Mr. Mulock. But apart altogether from the evil consequences which have already flowed from this dangerous combine, I ask the graduates, Is it reasonable that Mr. Barwick's firm should have such a preponderating

representa
members
but as the
tation of
addition
Seath.
great adv
in the pr
to offer a
the Senat
about the
Universit
would be
profound

5. I
ciation, M
"wild an
justify su
to deal v
based on
answered
will be ti
Prof. Bal
the Vice
way in th
long as t
one he w
the Park
favour of
to go to
Creelman
made by
articles o
in a posi
lofty the

6. I
contest n
Are we
from M
Barwick
his own
"go to t
is possib
with the
as Mr. B
from him
policy o
Barwick
order to
has not

As
other ec
those c
matters
advice
Associat
urged t

ers cause some
of his manifesto
s smile. Now,
faculty, in whose
to be formed?
that there is also
ons in Knox and
ty "had devised
dered necessary
association, when
s "calamitous"?
ersity politics is
icular instance.
unifesto in a day

SQUAIR.

RS.

urwick's mani-

certain lecturers
On this subject
"called down"
committee to
s connection it
cellor, who was
eipal Caven.

ce of the claim
x voted, it still
Latin, French,
ouncils of the
to the Senate,
ation on the
the graduates.
e and vander-
gentlemen will
k. One ques-
Latin, French,
Senate as Mr.
l Aylesworth,
ecent partner.
orters, Messrs.
a majority of
lemen consti-
together from
ine, I ask the
reponderating

representation as it has? Under other circumstances, if the Senate contained a thousand members it might be proper to comply with Mr. Barwick's demands on behalf of his firm, but as that body is limited, I would respectfully suggest that for the present the representation of this firm be limited by leaving at least Mr. Barwick at home. I remark that in addition to Messrs. Dale and vanderSmussen, Mr. Barwick takes exception also to Mr. Seath. There can be no doubt that the presence of Mr. Seath on the Senate would be of great advantage to education in our country. He is a gentleman whose life has been spent in the practical working of our educational system, and no man is better qualified than he to offer advice on all those intricate practical problems which it is the main business of the Senate to solve. It is particularly desirable to have members of Senate who know all about the schools of our country, so that the relations subsisting between them and the University may be nicely adjusted. Men like Mr. Seath, Mr. Ballard, or Mr. Tytler would be of infinitely more service than a shipload of men like Mr. Barwick, who are profoundly ignorant of educational problems.

5. In referring to the attitude of the press, and the proceedings of the Alumni Association, Mr. Barwick speaks of "untruthful newspaper articles" on the one hand, and "wild and incorrect speeches" on the other, but he does not favour us with anything to justify such strong language. In this connection, Mr. Barwick had a splendid opportunity to deal with the articles in the *Mail*, which contained no untruthful statements, being based on the official documents of the Senate. Why have these articles never been answered? When Mr. Barwick has pointed out the errors of fact or judgment in them it will be time enough for him to talk of untruthfulness, but not before. Let me also invite Prof. Baker to do the same, who at one meeting of the Alumni Association declared that the Vice-Chancellor "had been attacked in a scandalous, highly offensive, and personal way in the public press," and also Mr. Marsh, who at the same meeting asserted that "so long as the Senate was dragooned either through the public press or a meeting like the one he was addressing, the Senate would not pass the motion" to appoint a committee on the Park Hospital matter, although "he was, under certain modifications, personally in favour of it"—an attitude reminding one of the Irishman's pig, which could only be got to go to Cork by driving him to Blarney. If these gentlemen will not reply, perhaps Mr. Creelman will, inasmuch as, in his opinion, the alleged newspaper attacks "ought not to be made by any man having gentlemanly instincts." When these gentlemen dispose of the articles of the newspapers which were so offensive to their refined sensibilities, we shall be in a position to judge who are they who deliver "wild and incorrect speeches" on the lofty theme of Vice-Chancellor Mulock's wonderful doings.

6. I am sure all will agree with Mr. Barwick that it will be a calamity if the present contest results in excluding "all independent and progressive opinion from the Senate." Are we then to understand that reforms, educational and otherwise, have come in the past from Mr. Barwick and the Mulock party with whom he is allied? If so, will Mr. Barwick kindly specify what they were, distinguishing carefully those which emanated from his own firm? As to his allegation that certain anti-Mulock candidates would, if elected, "go to the Senate with personal interests of their own to serve," will he explain how this is possible, seeing that the matter of promotions and appointments in the Arts Faculty rests with the Government and not with the Senate? Let me emphasize this point particularly as Mr. Barwick's misrepresentation in this respect is a sample of what we may expect from him during the contest. The question before the electorate is whether Mr. Mulock's policy of following "the crooked and covered way" is to be approved or not, while Mr. Barwick tries to make it appear that a number of us are trying to get on the Senate in order to get promotions and appointments, when he knows perfectly well that the Senate has nothing in the world to do with such affairs. Could anything be more dishonest?

As to educational progress in the future, are we to look to members of the faculty and other educational experts, or to the members of Mr. Barwick's firm? Are we to look to those engaged in an engrossing occupation far removed from all pertaining to educational matters, or to those whose life work is education? On this point I would refer to the advice given by Sir Daniel Wilson, who, at the organization of the University Alumni Association, in speaking of the approaching election to the University Senate, "strongly urged the graduates to elect from their number twelve men, good and true, who would

defend to the utmost the rights of the University, and not to make the mistake of entrusting their interests in the Senate to men who have no interest in the University."

7. In partial justification of Mr. Mulock's action in the erection of the Anatomical building and the Park Hospital transaction, Mr. Barwick takes the ground that in these matters the Vice-Chancellor was only following the practice which obtained formerly, and that "questions just as serious as either one of these two have been dealt with in the past without any reference to the Senate, and no complaint has ever been made to this day." The only examples of such irregularities which Mr. Barwick adduces in support of this contention are (1) "the appointment of a professor to teach mathematics, formerly taught by Prof. Loudon;" (2) the appropriation of money for the physical apparatus; and (3) the allotment of rooms to the physical department. As Prof. Loudon has already disposed of the last two cases by showing that at the time they were arranged the Senate had nothing to do with such matters, it is not necessary for me to say anything further. I am surprised, however, to hear that there was anything irregular in the appointment of Mr. Baker to the chair of mathematics, and I shall be glad to hear from Mr. Barwick some further explanation in addition to his brief complaint about this particular business. Whatever the irregularity may have been it can hardly be laid at the door of Prof. Loudon, who was in Germany during the year the event occurred. Let us have more light, Mr. Barwick, on this important event in the career of Prof. Baker. But even supposing that former Senates did not fully exercise their powers and perform their duties, did that fact justify their chairman, Vice-Chancellor Mulock, in concealing from the Senate such important matters as the erection of an Anatomical building, the gift of lands for hospital purposes, and his arrangement to erect, equip and maintain further buildings for medical teaching purposes? Did the alleged apathy of the Senate excuse the deception practiced in these matters by the Vice-Chancellor on the Board of Trustees and the Government? Does Mr. Barwick yet understand that the main charge against the Vice-Chancellor is his policy of deception, which he has carried on so long? Such a policy is not to be justified or condoned even if Mr. Barwick's absurd claims as to the value of the Vice-Chancellor's services and the amount of his contributions to the University were true—which to my mind is very doubtful. As to the contention that Mr. Mulock inherited his peculiar methods of administration from his predecessors, I presume that, so far as his policy of deception is concerned, Mr. Barwick will admit that it was Mr. Mulock's own peculiar attribute, and that none of it came from the previous vice-chancellors, Chief Justice Moss, Dr. L. W. Smith, and Mr. Langton. If Mr. Barwick does not admit this, will he point out wherein any of these gentlemen deceived either the Senate or the Government? Further, will he cite cases to prove that Chief Justice Moss usurped the powers of the Senate or in any way resembled the novel type of Vice-Chancellor which was introduced for the first, and let us hope last, time into University administration in the person of Mr. Mulock.

8. With regard to Mr. Houston's motions on the Park Hospital transaction and the Anatomical building I shall allow Mr. Houston himself to speak. That "investigation of these two questions is now desired by the Vice-Chancellor," as Mr. Barwick declares, I am slow to believe. If true, the declaration is the first sign of penitence which the Vice-Chancellor has yet exhibited, but it is strangely inconsistent with the attitude which he assumed at the meeting of the Senate, when, after the carrying of the whitewashing resolution, as I understand, he suggested the withdrawal of Mr. Houston's motion for an investigation into the Anatomical building matter, although Mr. Aylesworth had pointed out the expediency of the Vice-Chancellor's insisting there and then on a full investigation. As to the Park Hospital matter, it is quite safe to court investigation in the future, because that is sure to come with the advent of the new Senate; but why was such investigation voted down last June? And why did Mr. Barwick endorse Mr. Mulock's action in both these matters before an investigation into either had taken place? In the official statements already made, and the truth of which is unquestioned, I think there is more than enough evidence on which to condemn Mr. Mulock; but no additional evidence is likely to cause Mr. Barwick to revoke his endorsement of Mr. Mulock's actions.

9. In conclusion, let me say, that my opposition to the Vice-Chancellor does not rest alone on the charges which have been made in connection with the two matters above referred to. In common with other members of the faculty and examiners generally, I

have other charges against experienced who has suffered disastrous in disguise, University

TORON

SIR,—
he made ab
in the pub

1. He
and the Bi
mover and
feeling agai
one of the
moved by r
to investig
statement o
doing or si
warranted
of others, c
the subject
for attack
at all in s
committee,
obviously t

2. Mr
college exp
because the
Mulock.
fault with
is absolute
my motion

3. Mr
Vice-Chan
now that l
it he shoul
personnel,
Board to
trustees.
Vice-Chan
Prof. Galk
now. Of
be thought
the propos
so grimly,

take of entrust-
ersity."

the Anatomical
ad that in these
ed formerly, and
with in the past
de to this day."
support of this
formerly taught
tus; and (3) the
easily disposed of
ate had nothing
I am surprised,
f Mr. Baker to
ek some further
ss. Whatever
oudon, who was
t, Mr. Barwick,
ng that former
that fact justify
such important
spital purposes,
medical teaching
etected in these
ent? Does Mr.
is his policy of
ustified or con-
cancellor's services
ny mind is very
thods of admin-
ception is con-
tribute, and that
L. W. Smith,
wherein any of
er, will he cite
or in any way
first, and let us

action and the
"investigation
wick declares,
nce which the
attitude which
e whitewashing
motion for an
th had pointed
investigation.
in the future,
was such inves-
Mulock's action
In the official
there is more
al evidence is
ons.

does not rest
matters above
s generally, I

have other grounds which, from an educational point of view, are more serious than the charges aforesaid; grounds which will be readily understood by any examiner who has ever experienced the overbearing conduct of the Vice-Chancellor at examiners' meetings, or, who has struggled with others to prevent him impairing our standards. On this account disastrous as his inroads on the endowment have been, I should look upon them as blessings in disguise, greater than even the fire, if their discovery leads to his withdrawal from University administration.

Yours, etc.,

TORONTO, August 6.

J. SQUAIR.

UNIVERSITY SENATE ELECTION

To the Editor of the Mail.

SIR,—After giving Mr. Walter Barwick time to correct some misstatements which he made about myself in his recently published address to the graduates, I find it necessary in the public interest to correct them for him.

1. He alleges that "when the resolutions with regard to the Park Hospital Trust and the Biological building were introduced into the Senate, they were dealt with by the mover and seconder of the resolution in such a manner that it was manifest personal feeling against the Vice-Chancellor prompted the resolution." As a matter of fact, only one of the resolutions above referred to was introduced at the meeting, and that was moved by myself and seconded by Prof. Loudon. It was the one asking for a committee to investigate the Park Hospital question. In moving it, I confined myself to the barest statement of the facts laid before the Senate in the Bursar's report; I imputed no wrong doing or sinister motives to anybody, and I said nothing that in the slightest degree warranted Mr. Barwick's accusation. Mr. Mulock has, since that meeting, in the presence of others, expressly informed me that he had no objection to my manner of dealing with the subject, and I shall be surprised to find that he approves of Mr. Barwick's uncalled for attack on me. It is equally uncalled for as regards Prof. Loudon, who made no remarks at all in seconding my motion. We both expected that the Senate would appoint the committee, and did not deem it necessary to argue in favour of a course that was so obviously the proper one to take.

2. Mr. Barwick alleges that "every head of a federated university and affiliated college expressed himself as opposed to the resolution for this reason"—that is to say, because the mover and seconder were apparently actuated by personal feeling against Mr. Mulock. As a matter of fact, not a member of Senate, head of College, or other found fault with our manner of introducing the matter, and therefore Mr. Barwick's assertion is absolutely untrue. Nothing we said had any effect whatever in evoking opposition to my motion to appoint a committee.

3. Mr. Barwick alleges that "investigation of these two questions is desired by the Vice-Chancellor." I was not aware that Mr. Mulock ever expressed such a desire, but now that he has done so he can easily be accommodated. If he had been at all eager for it he should have asked the Senate to pass my resolution, for he could not object to its personnel, especially as he had been, with Dr. Hoskin, appointed by the Park Hospital Board to confer with the Senate committee and with one representing the University trustees. The joint committee would then have been made up of the Chancellor, the Vice-Chancellor, Dr. Hoskin, Prof. Loudon, Dr. McLaren, Dr. Cameron, Mr. Aylesworth, Prof. Galbraith and myself. Mr. Barwick cannot name a more representative committee now. Of course, to have passed my resolution after Dr. Burwash's that night was not to be thought of. "Jeddart justice" was hanging a man first and trying him afterwards; the proposal to try the Vice-Chancellor after acquitting him is just as exquisitely, if not so grimly, humorous.

4. Mr. Barwick charges me with attempting to "ruin Mr. Mulock's career." The best answer to this charge is to be found in the text of the amendment which I moved as a substitute for Dr. Burwash's sweeping exculpation :—

"While there is no reason to doubt that the Vice-Chancellor, in his action with respect to the lease of the College street lots to the Park Hospital Board, and the erection of the addition to the Biological building was actuated by a desire to promote the interest of the University, this Senate cannot approve of his conduct in neglecting to consult it on such important matters of academical policy."

This amendment was voted down by an overwhelming majority, amongst whom were Mr. Barwick, Mr. Justice Falconbridge, Prof. Baker, Mr. MacMureby, Mr. Marsh, and Mr. Creelman. The only representatives of the graduates who voted for it besides myself were Prof. Loudon, Prof. Galbraith, and Mr. Maclean. In spite of Mr. Barwick's assertion to the contrary, that amendment correctly defines my attitude towards the Vice-Chancellor and his policy on the two matters in question. *Mutatis mutandis* it defines my attitude towards the whole administrative policy of the University. It is in strict accord with the University Act, which declares that the Senate shall, subject to the provisions of the Income and Property Act, "have the management of and superintendency over the affairs and business of the University." I know that my reiteration of this view of the Senate's functions and my persistent efforts to magnify the Senate's office have been very tiresome to the Vice-Chancellor, but there is a vast difference between trying to "ruin his career," and trying to thwart his policy regarding a great public trust, in relation to which I have as good a right to my opinion as he has to his. Mr. Barwick may be prepared to abnegate his senatorial functions to the Vice-Chancellor; I am not, and no one knows this better than Mr. Mulock does, after our experience of ten years together. In connection with this same accusation let me add that he has held his Vice-Chancellorship for the past three years on my nomination, made under circumstances of which he retains, I am certain, a vivid recollection, though apparently Mr. Barwick either never knew or has forgotten them.

5. Mr. Barwick repeats the Vice-Chancellor's own plea of extenuation, that the practice of consulting the Senate on important questions of policy is of late growth. Even if this assertion were true it would not justify Mr. Mulock's admitted persistent and successful efforts to keep from the public, the Senate, the University Trustees, the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council, and the Legislative Assembly the fact that the addition to the Biological building was really intended for medical teaching purposes when he was asking an appropriation to provide increased accommodation for science. But the assertion is not true. It is, in fact, an aspersion on every previous occupant of Mr. Mulock's office, as the minutes of the Senate abundantly prove. Mr. Mulock is the first Vice-Chancellor who ever thought of ignoring, not to say deceiving, the Senate in a matter of so much importance as either the Park Hospital or the Biological building extension.

Yours, etc.

WM. HOUSTON.

Toronto, August 10.

UNIVERSITY MATTERS.

To the Editor of the Mail.

SIR,—In the *Mail* of August 1 and August 2, respectively, appear somewhat lengthy contributions from Mr. Walter Barwick, and one who declares himself "A Signer of the Manifesto." Both these gentlemen seem to be labouring under an amount of excitement—due, perhaps, to the hot weather—that has caused them, for the time being, to allow their irritability to run away with their sound judgment and common

sense.
sult of
yielding
to their
abuse of

W
of grad
the Un
confess
sity po
Tyler,
I can a
dition

M
think t
votes f
campai
ward p
they an

A
fertile
treason
serious
any oth
the hop
questio
graduat
and an
in the
seek to
rollers,
ests of
most d
den on
encing
formed
been in
nition
ing bo
they n
to ext
of ill-i

N
not wi
ceedin
brought
eloque
the pu
stand

I
Chanc
produc
Barwi
other
when
or wit
respon

sense. Two letters to the press "full of sound and fury, signifying nothing," are the result of awakening to the consciousness that the old order of things was changing and yielding to the new. Like many persons when disturbed from a slumber that is pleasing to them, they give way to their passions, as soon as aroused, and vent their torrent of abuse on the heads of those who have been alive and active whilst they slept.

When these two gentlemen come, therefore, as mentors and advisers, before the body of graduates interested in the approaching election of members to serve on the Senate of the University of Toronto, it is but too painfully apparent, as indeed Mr. Barwick naïvely confesses, that the one "has been prevented from becoming fully acquainted with University politics," while the innocent admission of the other "Of Messrs. Ballard, of Hamilton; Tytler, of Guelph; and Herridge, of Ottawa, I know very little, and, after much searching, I can add nothing to my store of knowledge," shows him to be in a most lamentable condition of ignorance and misinformation.

Mr. Barwick and his somewhat "slangy" coadjutor, make a serious mistake if they think to delude the graduates by their noisy and abusive rhetoric. They will gain no votes for their candidates by abandoning the logic of facts and devoting themselves to a campaign of vituperation, in which they seem anxious to exhaust the vocabulary of the ward politician, with whose methods, to judge from their skilful employment of his language, they are, doubtless, quite familiar.

At the risk of rendering myself guilty of the heinous crime of lese-Mulock, which the fertile brain of the eminent Q.C. has educed as the most exalted form of academical high-treason, I would have a few plain words with him and his friend. The present crisis is a serious one in the history of our Provincial University. It is vain for Mr. Barwick, or any other friend of the Vice-Chancellor, to attempt to draw a red herring over the trail in the hope of thereby diverting the attention of the graduates and the public from the real question at issue. Messrs. Squir, Dale, VanderSmitten, Fraser, Ellis, and Loudon, graduates of University College and of the University of Toronto, who have long been, and are now, fighting the battles of their alma mater alike against open foes and enemies in the guise of friends, are now on trial, as the underlings of the Vice-Chancellor would seek to have us believe. The crime of the men is not that they are "office seekers," "log-rollers," or "cabalists"—which assuredly they are not—but that, labouring in the interests of higher education, they have arrayed themselves against the worst "clique" and most desperate "cabal" that the history of the University has ever known. Having trodden on the toes of some of the real "cabalists" and "log-rollers," they are now experiencing the usual outpouring of wrath and resentment. The consciousness of having performed their duty well, in having striven for rights with which they ought long ago to have been invested—not professorial chairs, though they all deserve them, but proper recognition of their important departments and adequate representation of them on the governing board of the college, together with the gratitude of their alma mater for the efforts they made to prevent her sacrifice at the hands of an incapable vice-chancellor—will serve to extinguish any resentment they might feel at the unfounded and unmanly insinuations of ill-informed letter-writers.

No, Mr. Barwick, et al., you have no case, and abusing the plaintiff's attorney will not win you the cause. It is Mr. Mulock, the Vice-Chancellor, whose trial is now proceeding, and unless you occupy yourself in a badly needed defence of the policy which has brought the University into financial straits and disrepute, silence will be more eloquent on his behalf than all the abusive epistles his friends may venture to inflict upon the public. Mr. Mulock and his methods have had the veil torn from them, and they stand forth in all their nakedness.

I have no fear of the verdict. To be plain, the time has passed when the Vice-Chancellor can pose as "Sir Oracle," and expect profound silence to reign while the products of his academical genius are being born and reared. If, as we are told by Mr. Barwick, Mr. Mulock "has devoted more of his means to educational affairs than any other man in Ontario," the University has bought his charity at too dear a cost, and, when the aegis of his "protection" shall have been withdrawn from her, she will not falter or wither, but grow stronger and more able to withstand the attacks of her foes, and respond to the hopes and wishes of her friends.

It is the "new policy" against the old, as represented by the Vice-Chancellor and his coterie, from whom the recent changes for the better in the University—few they are, but full of promise—have been wrested by the interposition of the honoured Chancellor, who, convinced by unanswerable facts, is making it his care that justice shall be done. In the way of these necessary reforms, yielding only when absolutely forced to do so, are Mr. Mulock and his supporters. If the graduates desire to give the Hon. Edward Blake and the true friends of the University a fair chance to carry out the policy outlined in the words of the eloquent Chancellor himself:—"To administer its resources to the best advantage, to apply so far as these resources allow, all the most modern and approved methods, and to vindicate its existence in the future, as they believe they have done in the past," they will help to remove the present Vice-Chancellor and those members of the Senate who have been his supporters in the Park Hospital and Biological building scheme, and see that in future everything is done honestly and above board. In his whole policy the Vice-Chancellor is inimical to the best interests of the University—not merely in its financial but in its educational aspects also. It is no secret that he has been opposed to the raising of the standard for matriculation and pass graduation. In this he has been assisted by a professor who didn't sign the manifesto, but who obtained an office, and who, in more than one instance, has allied himself with the reactionary forces. The idea of the coterie to which these both belong is that the University "should not make it hard" for the sons of rich men "who must have a degree" to graduate from our grand provincial institution. Financially and educationally the University will do well to shake off entirely these men and seek the counsel of others, whose promises to husband her resources and to guard her honour will be no empty ones.

Mr. Barwick and his friends are particularly annoyed at the existence and activity of the "Alumni Association." It is the *bête noire* of their lucubrations. To read their excited protests one would be led to think that there had suddenly sprung up in our midst an academical "Tammany," the members of which were all "ward heelers" and "political hacks" of the most approved sort.

If it be wrong, if it be a crime, for the graduates to gather together for the protection of their alma mater in her hour of peril, then the members of the "Alumni Association" are wrong-doers and criminals. If to protest by all lawful means against the mutilation of her endowment and the aspersion of her honour be "log-rolling," then are they "log-rollers." If to denounce an offender and to demand his dismissal from office be "reprehensible electioneering cabals," they must plead guilty to the charge. But these charges have no foundation except in the imagination of a few of the more excitable of the friends of the Vice-Chancellor and his methods.

I for one am not ashamed to be of those who decline to stand idly by and permit the real "axe grinders" and false friends of University College to continue to endanger the very existence of my alma mater, that grand old college that for so many years has stood firm as the exponent of unsectarian higher education.

My advice to the graduates of the University of Toronto is: Pay no attention to "weak inventions of the enemy," but vote to support the Chancellor of the University in the new programme of reform which he has inaugurated, by returning to the Senate the twelve candidates who will support the "new policy," the announcement of whose candidature has so ruffled the temper of Mr. Barwick and others of Mr. Mulock's friends.

Yours, etc.,

ANOTHER SIGNER OF THE MANIFESTO

TORONTO, Aug. 3

S
week,
"
receiv
lands—
T
College
Profes
reconc
that P
\$200 p
As the
worth
medica
up for
large p
for a v
not be
Unive
hospita
would,
annual
sor Ba
scarcel
Gener
Hospit
the Ge
The ne
in the
studen
the th
of the
How
the To
surge
shoul
save
way f
drain
Hospit
incom
pelled
lack o
I
was n
rival
and o
"
"kno
Senat

PROF. BAKER'S STATEMENT.

To the Editor of the Mail.

SIR,—In Professor Baker's paper, read at the meeting of the Alumni Association last week, I find the following sentence:—

"For the hospital lands, if anything ever comes of the hospital scheme, we are to receive the fees of the students, which means about five per cent. on the value of the lands—as much as is received anywhere for leased lands."

This is said in extenuation of Mr. Mulock's conduct in leasing lots 8 and 9, facing College street, to the Park Hospital for 999 years. I have looked up the subject since Professor Baker's paper was published, and find it extremely difficult, if not impossible, to reconcile the above statement with facts. It is currently reported in University circles that Professor Baker, whom I regard as an expert real estate valuator, places the land at \$200 per foot, and on very careful estimates it is regarded as worth per foot \$150 at least. As there are about 400 feet of frontage, the land, according to the lower estimate, must be worth \$60,000. It is provided in the lease that the University shall put up a building for medical teaching purposes on these lots, and pay for its maintenance. Any building put up for these purposes would not cost less than \$20,000. A smaller building on such a large piece of ground would suggest the incongruity of having a very large toasting pan for a very small chestnut. The total cost, therefore, of the scheme to the University would not be less than \$80,000. For this sum Professor Baker appears to imagine that the University will receive annually five per cent., or \$4,000, in the shape of students' fees for hospital "walking." The cost of maintenance would not be one cent less than \$500, and it would, in all probability, be near \$1,500. The scheme, therefore, to furnish five per cent. annually to the University chest, would have to ensure a revenue of \$4,500 at least. Professor Baker's suggestion that this sum, or any like sum, would be met by students' fees will scarcely bear examination. The students, about 250 in number, who "walked" the General hospital last session, paid a little more than \$3,800, which sum went into the Hospital fund and not into the treasury of either medical school. Deprived of this revenue, the General Hospital, though fairly well managed financially, would find itself in straits. The new Park Hospital will find it necessary also to take and keep every cent that is paid in the shape of fees, whatever these may be. Now let us examine the question from the students' standpoint. The number of students which the University may hope to have in the third and fourth years may never be more than 160, and, owing to the requirements of the Medical Council and of the University Curriculum, it may be much less than this. How can 160 students pay \$4,500, or \$29 each, per annum, for clinical surgery alone, when the Toronto General Hospital cannot charge more than \$24 for three years for both clinical surgery and clinical medicine? The students maintain that they pay enough now, and I should not be surprised if they rebelled against any attempt to "bleed" them in order to save Messrs. Mulock, McFarlane and Wright. Possibly Professor Baker has some feasible way for "bleeding," but if he has I hope he will explain how the students may stand a drain of \$4,500 annually for a term of 999 years; and how, if they do stand it, the Park Hospital is going to do without such sum, in order to make good the loss to the University income. Failing to get a satisfactory answer to these questions I shall be reluctantly compelled to believe that Professor Baker exhibits, what I have not yet thought possible, a lack of insight into business affairs that is hardly consistent with mathematical ability.

Professor Baker said further, in speaking of the Anatomical building: "If secrecy was maintained, it was for fear of adverse criticism, not from our own graduates, but from rival medical schools. The biological policy was known to many members of the Senate and of the Arts Faculty, yet no agitation was then started."

This is a most remarkable statement. The Anatomical building scheme was certainly "known" to Drs. Adam H. Wright and McFarlane, amongst the members of the present Senate, but no one has ever hinted that Professor Baker "knew." Must we regard his

statement as an indirect confession that he was fully aware of the fact that the building, then supposedly in construction for the Biological Department, was really intended for Anatomy! or is the statement an example of the many inaccuracies with which his paper teems, and which even an unmethodical mathematician ought to have avoided?

Yours, etc.,

M. B.

Toronto, August 13.

THE UNIVERSITY CONTROVERSY.

To the Editor of the Mail.

SIR,—As no one has made a general answer to the paper read by Prof. Baker at the last meeting of the Alumni Association, I propose, with your permission, to deal with some of his statements to which attention has not yet been directed. And, in the first place, I desire to express surprise that, in referring to the foundation of the association, he should have misrepresented the aims of those who were active in the work of organizing it and setting it on its feet. Prof. Baker was at the inaugural meeting, at which he presided most of the evening. Mr. Dale was the chief speaker, and, as everyone knows, his views were heartily endorsed by the late president, Sir Daniel Wilson. If Prof. Baker saw anything to condemn at that or the next meeting, why did he not speak out? Why nurse his wrath until the late meeting, when it exploded in a succession of insinuations of concealment, of bitterness and of insincerity against the officers of the association, ending in the assertion that in the proceedings they had "electioneering purposes" mainly in view. Now, sir, as an active member of the association, I know that every effort was made to steer clear of electioneering business; and the only attempt which has so far been made in that direction was that of Prof. Baker, who resorted at the last meeting to such questionable means to get his electioneering paper before the meeting. His conduct on that occasion was a revelation to me, as it was to many others, who thought him incapable of such tactics. Still greater was my surprise to see that he persisted in publishing unfounded assertions on various matters after his inaccuracies had been pointed out at the meeting. The publication of his paper has accordingly prompted me to make the following observations:—

1. In dealing with the history of Senate control, Prof. Baker refers to the attempts of Mr. Mulock ten or twelve years ago "to interest the Senate in the finances of the University," but it grieves Prof. Baker to be obliged to say that the "interest was so feeble" that the practice of presenting annual financial reports "fell into desuetude." Now, if this little reminiscence of Prof. Baker's is true, how does he explain the aversion which Mr. Mulock subsequently manifested towards letting the Senate get the bursar's annual statement? Is Professor Baker ignorant of the Vice-Chancellor's attempts to keep the report of 1889-90 from the Senate, and to spirit it away just before it was wanted by a committee? Does he not know that the report for the next year which the Vice-Chancellor presented showed that there were no funds for a modern language fellowship, although the committee aforesaid had presented a report showing that there must be funds—a conclusion confirmed a few months later by the Chancellor, who found that there were thousands of dollars for such purposes? If Prof. Baker is ignorant of these well-known facts he cannot be ignorant of the Vice-Chancellor's hostile attitude towards the creation of the Finance Committee—an attitude with which Prof. Baker evidently sympathized, for he refused to serve on the committee. Does all this look like "a disposition to bring matters under the control of the Senate" either on the part of the Vice-Chancellor or his apologist, Prof. Baker?

2. In order to justify Mr. Mulock's action in the erection of the Anatomical building, Prof. Baker appeals to certain cases which were, like it, not submitted to the Senate, *e.g.*, the grant of land to Victoria College, utterly ignoring the fact

that t
whilst
tions a
posses
reserv
deane

3
Colleg
really
vote,"
street
Hospit
Prof.
"Sen
Mulock
and a
is of a
office
conser
under
except
Mr. M
Senat
Facul
Senat
questi

Univ
accou
an ex
attitu

that
anato
secre
which
every
conce
for th
and i
ment
that
the s
admi
becau
the v

that the characteristic feature of the former transaction was the concealment practised, whilst that of the latter was its publicity. The fact that Prof. Baker puts such transactions as these in the same category seems to indicate that his ethical sense, if he ever possessed one, has been dulled by his slavish attachment to his master, or perhaps it is reserved exclusively for those high offices which he discharges within the precincts of the deanery.

3. In referring to Mr. Houston's motion for the appointment of a committee on the College street lots, Professor Baker now takes the novel position that the motion was not really necessary—a position never taken, I believe, by anybody except himself. "The vote," he says, "did not in the least prevent the enquiry respecting the lease of the College street lots from proceeding. The representatives of the Board of Trustees and of the Hospital Trust could meet, make their enquiry, and hand in their report." This attitude of Prof. Baker does not seem quite consistent with his declared attachment to the principle of "Senate control;" but will he explain how the Senate could be thus ignored when Mr. Mulock tells us in his defence "that the hospital is practically under the control of Senate," and adds, "I trust that the Senate will first decide whether the presence of the hospital is of any, and, if so, what service to the University." "They (the hospital trustees) hold office at the will of the Senate and can make no disposition of the property without the consent of the Senate." If, then, as Mr. Mulock says, the hospital trustees are so much under the control of the Senate, is Prof. Baker's present absurd position of any value except to show that his plank of "Senate control" disappears at the nod of his master, Mr. Mulock? But will Prof. Baker explain how his present attitude and his vote on the Senate about the College street lots square with his action at the meeting of the Arts Faculty, when he voted in favour of a motion which was unanimously carried, that "the Senate be requested to take steps with a view to the restoration of the property" in question.

TORONTO, Aug. 13th.

Yours, etc.,

HANS.

THE UNIVERSITY SENATE.

To the Editor of the Mail.

SIR,—In view of the occurrences at the meeting of the Alumni Association of University College, and because of the fact that the reports published give an incorrect account of the issues between Professor Baker and myself, I think it necessary to make an explanation of the statements then made by that gentleman, and of his subsequent attitude with regard to them.

Professor Baker stated that a certain medical "ticket" claimed, in their platform, that the University should furnish from its endowment funds for the chairs of physiology, anatomy and pathology, and that certain Arts graduates, whom he would not name, were secretly supporting this raid on the endowment. As there is but one medical "ticket," on which are the names of Drs. Cameron, Reeve, Mullin and Macallum, it was plain to everyone that the charge was directed against me and my colleagues. So far as I was concerned, it appeared practically to be an insinuation that I had entered on a campaign for the purpose of promoting my own interests in connection with the chair of physiology, and it was at this that I felt indignant. Even had he omitted all reference to the department of physiology, the charge, as he put it, was extremely unfair, and I am glad to say that he now recognizes that it is so. He removed from the paper, before publishing it, all the sentences containing this charge, and he has made a full apology on this score, having admitted to me that he had misinterpreted our attitude. I deem this explanation necessary, because the omission of this charge from the published paper would lead the readers of the various reports to believe that I was refuting charges that were not made.

Our platform, which Professor Baker misinterpreted, is similar to that of the Chancellor, Mr. Blake, (who certainly cannot be accused of hostility to the arts faculty of the University), and states that when the needs of the Arts Faculty are met, substantial aid should be granted to the scientific departments connected with medicine. Mr. Blake, in his convocation address delivered this year, held that the departments of anatomy, pathology, and sanitary science should be thus assisted, and that the University public should be educated up to the point of granting this assistance. Our platform does not go further than that of the Chancellor, and it is apparently in agreement with the tenth section of the Arts manifesto, which reads as follows :—

“ We gladly recognize the great and growing value of the medical faculty. We deem it the duty of the university to encourage, as far as circumstances and our prior obligations permit, the promotion of medical education ; and we shall welcome the day when the university can afford to give substantial aid for such purposes.”

The platform containing this clause is supported by about two hundred Arts graduates, including Professors Alexander, Hume, Hutton, Ellis, Galbraith, Loudon and McCurdy. Even Professor Baker and Mr. Barwick admit that the platform is such as they can support, and I have not yet heard anyone condemn it. That being the case, it may be safely assumed that our platform has on the point in question the approval of the University public.

Some of the supporters of Drs. A. H. Wright and McFarlane have, for the purpose, apparently, of injuring the candidature of the “ ticket,” used this part of our platform to indicate that we support Mr. Mulock’s course during the last five years. To state this charge is but to refute it.

Yours, etc.,

TORONTO, August 6.

A. B. MACALLUM.

(This letter is substantially the same as one sent to the GLOBE but not published).

UNIVERSITY SENATE ELECTIONS.

To the Editor of the Globe.

SIR,—In the *Globe* of August 12, “ Graduate ” takes upon himself the rôle made familiar to us by the efforts of Mr. Barwick and Prof. Baker. It is the same old policy of misrepresentation and abuse—the same attempt by vituperating Mr. Squair, Mr. Houston and others, by impugning their honesty and devotion to their *alma mater*, and by deliberately distorting fact into fiction, to divert the attention of the graduates of the University from the real question at issue in these elections—the actions of Mr. Mulock and his conduct as Vice-Chancellor.

The personal attacks and insinuations need no reply ; they refute themselves. I can only assure “ Graduate ” that the airing he has given his vocabulary will advantage his party even less than the more pretentious displays of his confederates.

“ Graduate ” seems to allow the Senate’s “ whitewashing ” of Mr. Mulock to loom so large in his horizon as to obscure everything else. He seems to think that the Senate is the only body competent to pass judgment on these matters. Let me tell him that there are other and important bodies which do not agree with the Senate :

(a) The faculty, almost to a man, are opposed to Mr. Mulock’s general policy in University matters. They have, by resolution, expressed their disapproval of his action with respect to the Park Hospital. In their opposition to the system of “ meddling and muddling,” inaugurated by the Vice-Chancellor, the faculty represent a principle the maintenance of which is essential to the welfare of the University.

(b) The Alumni Association, representing the graduates of University College and the University of Toronto, has passed a similar resolution. The attempt of Prof. Baker and Mr. King to delude the Alumni by an ingenious compound of fiction and abuse brought out the fact that the majority of graduates opposed to Mr. Mulock is simply overwhelming.

(c) Apparently, the Board of Trustees have lost confidence in Mr. Mulock, inasmuch as he is no longer their Chairman—Mr. Blake having been elected Chairman, and Mr. Hoskin Vice-Chairman.

(d) That Mr. Mulock has not the approval of the Government seems evident from the following statement of the Chancellor in his address delivered at the last Convocation of the University: "They (the members of the Government) stated that they had lately ascertained that the addition to the Biological building was designed, not wholly for the science purposes of the University, but partly for the medical teaching of anatomy; and that they had lately understood that examination and degree fees, and tuition fees, for services rendered at the expense of the Arts or general funds, were being put to the credit of the Medical Faculty funds. They added that the action taken in these matters, being in contravention of their understanding and intention, policy and pledges, could not be maintained, and that the existing arrangements must be modified; and they requested us to devise some plan under which the addition to the Biological building should, according to the authority for its construction, be devoted exclusively to the science purposes of the University, and some arrangement under which the general or Arts funds should receive the fees referred to."

The Minister of Education has also stated, with regard to the lease of the College street lots, his willingness to consent to the restoration of the property to the University, if possible.

(e) That the Chancellor, the Hon. Edward Blake, lacks confidence in Mr. Mulock, can be seen both from his deeds and his words. If the Chancellor has so much confidence in Mr. Mulock, why has he taken the chair at meetings of the Senate to the exclusion of the Vice-Chancellor? Why has he taken upon himself the direction of University affairs, if Mr. Mulock's *régime* has been the undisguised blessing that his friends would make it out to be? What mean the investigations and reports undertaken and prepared by the Chancellor himself?

If "Graduate" cannot comprehend the import of the Chancellor's advice to Mr. Mulock and his associates, not "to proceed by some crooked or covered way," he may be able to understand the following tribute to the Vice-Chancellor's administrative genius, paid by Mr. Blake in his Convocation Address of June last: "And, indeed, a large part of the time of some of us has been ever since devoted to efforts to disentangle, with the least possible disturbance of existing arrangements, and the least damage to the important interests concerned, the complications in which these questions had become involved." And "Graduate," forsooth, would have us support the talented innovator to whose "disinterested efforts" in academical matters we owe this policy of "blundering," the full development of which has been arrested by the interposition of Mr. Blake. The graduates will, I trust, stand firm at the side of their tried and trusted Chancellor, who has bent his energies to the task of disentangling the complications which have arisen through the mistaken policy of Mr. Mulock.

"Graduate" says that certain members of the faculty are in favour of enlarging the powers of the Senate as regards academical appointments. Let him produce some evidence to shew that any of the men in question are in favour of this, which seems to have been a feature in the old policy of the Vice-Chancellor, as is shewn by the fact that, on a certain occasion, Mr. Mulock having advanced the candidature of a certain individual for a professorship, and being incensed at the Government because they did not take his advice, headed a deputation in favour of establishing a board of patronage, on which occasion, it is said, he gave the Government collectively a piece of his mind, in language more forcible than elegant. If, then, blame attaches to any one for having advocated "the policy of enlarging the powers of the Senate in the matter of academical appointments," why does "Graduate" not put it on the right shoulders?

"Graduate" reiterates the foundationless cry that certain members of the faculty are endeavouring to secure election to the Senate of the University, in order that they may advance themselves to professorial chairs. The plain answer to this misrepresentation is that, as Professor Galbraith has shown, none of these gentlemen have ever asked the Senate for advancement, and that it is not the function of the Senate to make recommendations for promotions, still less to make appointments. If any further proof of this is needed, what better evidence can we have than the fact that the Senate is perfectly neutral at the present time, when several appointments are pending? The real functions of the Senate are to settle the various courses of study for students, to manage the examinations, and to settle the general policy as to the development of the different departments of University study. In every other University these important functions are discharged by the faculty, which generally constitute the Senate.

Does "Graduate" pretend to say that in Toronto the best men to give advice on these matters are, not members of the faculty, not educational experts like Messrs. Seath, Ballard and Tytler, but business men like Messrs. Creelman, Barwick and King? Does "Graduate" seriously aver that it is either expedient or in the interests of the University that Mr. Barwick's law firm should have four or five representatives on the Senate whilst the important departments of Latin, French, German, Italian and Spanish are denied all representation, except such as they can secure amongst the elected members? And does "Graduate" pretend that the settlement of disputed questions in these subjects, and in the literary and scientific courses generally, should be entrusted to the members of a law firm, however eminent, rather than to members of the faculty?

"Graduate" affects to believe that the opposition of certain members of the faculty to Mr. Mulock's administration is so strong that there must be some improper reason for it. Now, "Graduate" does not need to assume any thing of the kind. All that he has to do is to consider the way in which Mr. Mulock has treated the faculty in the past, and he will have a sufficient explanation of their attitude towards him. For instance, after the fire it was Mr. Mulock's policy to put the library in the old Convocation Hall and to make no enlargement of the rest of the building, a policy which, if carried out, would have made it impossible to accommodate the classes and to provide suitable accommodation for the library.

In Mr. Mulock's zeal to provide accommodation for anatomy he neglected to provide the necessary requirements for the teaching of Chemistry, Mineralogy and Geology. He refused also to provide the necessary teaching strength in Latin and Modern Languages, though the claims of these departments were so strong that, when the Chancellor was invited to investigate them, he at once recommended that assistant lecturers be appointed in all of them.

In his capacity of Chairman of the Board of Examiners, the Vice-Chancellor has alienated the sympathies of many members of the faculty by the brow-beating tactics to which he has but too often resorted.

I have given "Graduate" a few reasons. Perhaps he will think it unnecessary now to call upon Mr. Mulock for others.

Now a word or two in conclusion. Mr. Mulock's administration of the affairs of the University is condemned on all sides, by graduates all over the country of every profession and calling. The teachers of the province are particularly outspoken in their criticism of his mistaken and dangerous policy. It is the duty of all our graduates to put it beyond the power of Mr. Mulock to endanger the very existence of their *alma mater* in future years, and remembering that "well-meant ignorance is a grievous calamity in high places," to punish, those who supported him in his follies, by declaring them no longer fit to act as Senators of the University, though some may have erred more through ignorance than wilfulness. To sum up the issues of the contest in a word, it is Mr. Blake's policy against Mr. Mulock's—the new policy of reform and development, carried out honestly and above board, against the old policy of complication and entanglement. How can we expect Mr. Blake to stand at the helm if that helm is not allowed freely to traverse? It is, I repeat, the promoters of Mr. Blake's policy against those who have endorsed the questionable acts of Mr. Mulock.

ANOTHER GRADUATE.

August 15.